DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 898 CS 002 743

AUTHOR Mulcahy, Eugene F.
TITLE Identification and Summary Evaluation of Adult Remedial Education Programs in Hartford, Connecticut.
PUB DATE Sep 70
NOTE 138p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; Compensatory Education Programs; *English (Second Language); *High School Equivalency Programs; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut (Hartford)

ABSTRACT

Adult basic education programs existing in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1970 were catalogued and described in order to better understand what was available to adults in need of compensatory education. This document contains descriptions of 27 of the programs which attempted to meet the educational needs of adults functioning at low skill levels. Thirteen of these programs were evaluated by asking those involved with the programs to complete either an administrator evaluation form, a teacher questionnaire, a student questionnaire, or a student interview. Results of these evaluations are discussed. A review of the literature on adult basic education describes both the average adult learner and the average Hartford adult learner. (MKM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED124598

IDENTIFICATION AND SUMMARY

EVALUATION OF ADULT REMEDIAL

EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

Eugene F. Mulcahy
University of Hartford

September 15, 1970

CSC02 743

PROJECT STAFF

Eugene F. Mulcahy	Project Director
Thomas J. Moriarty, Jr.	Project Coordinator
James H. Barker	Program Writer
Margaret Owen Andrews	Research Associate
Peter David Browne	Research Associate
Robert Bresnick	Research Associate

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Louise Anderson

Thelma Anderson

Louise Coleman

Ruby Fort

Paul Grant

Lydia Mercado

Dorothy Roach

Doris Scott

Mary Scruse

Alice St. Laurent

Audrey Sutherland

STAFF VITA

Eugene F. Mulcahy - Project Director
M.A. - Brown University
C.A.G.S. - Boston College
Director of Instruction, New Careers Educational Component - University of Hartford
Formerly - Assistant Professor of Education, Central Connecticut State College, Salem State College (Massachusetts)
Alhikma University of Baghdad (Iraq)
Teacher, Newton Public Schools (Massachusetts), Brookline Public Schools (Massachusetts)

Thomas J. Moriarty, Jr. - Project Coordinator
B.S. - Central Connecticut State College
Teacher of Mathematics, Public Schools of Washington, D.C.
Formerly - Coordinator of Tutorial Programs, Revitalization Corps, Hartford, Connecticut

James H. Barker - Statistician - Program Writer
M.S. - University of Kentucky
Instructor of Mathematics, University of Hartford
Formerly - Revitalization Corps tutor, Coordinator of Warburton Chapel Tutorial Program

Margaret D. Andrews - Research Associate
Paraprofessional, Hartford Board of Education
Formerly - Project Concern aide

Peter D. Browne - Research Associate
B.A. (Candidate) - Central Connecticut State College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PROJECT STAFF.....iii

STAFF VITA.....iv

LIST OF TABLES.....vi

Chapter

I. DESCRIPTION, RATIONALE, DEFINITIONS, METHODS OF THE PROJECT.....1

II. SURVEY OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH.....10

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS NOT EVALUATED.....17

IV. DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.....34

V. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY.....55

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....112

APPENDIXES.....116

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....129

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Satisfaction Coefficient for All Groups	91
2.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Total Sample	92
3.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for All Males	93
4.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for All Females	94
5.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Persons Ages 16-19	95
6.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Persons Ages 20-29	96
7.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Persons Ages 30-39	97
8.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Persons Ages 40-49	98
9.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for All Foreign Born in Sample	99
10.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Hartford Adult School	100
11.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for C.E.P. -- English Questionnaire	101
12.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for C.E.P. -- Spanish Questionnaire	102
13.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for M.D.T.A. -- G.E.D. Classes	103
14.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for M.D.T.A. -- Basic Foreign Speaking	104
15.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for New Careers Program	105
16.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Neighborhood Youth Corps	106
17.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Learn Baby Learn Program	107
18.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for N.A.B. -- J.O.B.S.	108
19.	Distribution of Responses for Questions 1-13 for Hartford Group	109
20.	Sum of Responses to Questions 17 and 18 for Age and Sex Groupings	110
21.	Sum of Responses to Questions 17 and 18 for All Evaluated Programs	111

I

DESCRIPTION, RATIONALE, DEFINITIONS, METHODS OF THE PROJECT

The Cooperative Area Manpower Systems (CAMPS) Committee in Hartford has, since its formation in October of 1967, become increasingly concerned with the fragmentation of programs of adult remedial education in the city. It seems that the twenty or more programs sponsored both by the public and private sectors, have functioned in virtual isolation, unaware of one another's purposes, functioning, or existence.

The Hartford CAMPS Committee therefore formed a subcommittee on adult basic education. This subcommittee's purpose is to "review the structured basic education programs available in Hartford for out-of-school youth and adults; with particular attention to services available to the Spanish Speaking." This present study has been conducted with the purpose of that subcommittee in mind.

The project has been a cooperative venture between the Community Renewal Team (CRT) of Hartford and the University of Hartford. Both institutions share the concern of the CAMPS committee for identification and evaluation of existing programs. Funding for the research was granted by the Community Renewal Team and facilities and personnel of both CRT and the university were employed. Total funding for the project was $4500. Research was conducted during the period between June 26 and August 20, 1970.

RATIONALE - In Hartford as in cities across America, men and women are denied access to the mainstream of upward mobile economic and social life because of their lack of basic education and skills. The 1970 United States census charts an increase in illiteracy in America to the present rate of 11% of the population. The members of our illiterate population live in congested cities like Hartford and in isolated rural areas. There are more than 25 countries in the world where the national literacy rate is greater than that of the United States.

There is, fortunately, a growing awareness of the dimensions of this problem. Federal, State, City, and private programs are seeking to address themselves to the disenfranchised who are trapped by frustration and entombed by their lack of the basic skills necessary for a modicum of comfort and self respect in our society.

Business and industry have begun to recognize the great untapped sources of labor and human potential in the city. Innovative programs in many Hartford businesses and industries are beginning slowly to serve the need.

In Hartford, the intensity of this deep human and manpower problem has brought together a unique coalition of members of the urban community, political, business, industrial, and educational segments of the city.

The adult pursuing an education differs from the student who has followed the standard course of his education in two ways: in experience and in skills. In the first instance the adult has a vast advantage. In the second, the adult is at an often embarrassing and frustrating disadvantage.

Several solutions from diverse sectors of the community have been proposed. The comparative goals and effectiveness of these programs have not been studied. It is in the context of growing concern for the problem and the need to enumerate, consider, and evaluate the work now being done by diverse agents that the CAMPS sub-committee, the Community Renewal Team, and the University of Hartford have cooperated in preparing this report.

DEFINITION - Several problems develop when reference is made to "Adult Basic Education". Technically by state statute "Adult Basic Education" can only be offered by one of the 169 school districts in the State of Connecticut or by the state itself. This rather narrow and highly technical definition is used with less frequency then the broader definition which this report employs.

Adult in the sense of this study refers to any person over the age of 16 who is not a part of a standard elementary or secondary program of private or public education. This definition would include then, the recent teenage drop-out as well as the older person long out of school.

"Basic Education" refers to functional level skill training in language arts, computation, and social sciences. The definition excludes advanced secondary study, specific academic skill training, and training in specific industrial and business skills.

Some programs refer to the area "Basic Education" as "remedial education". This term suffers from the implication that the skills involved were once offered to the student and not mastered. This assumption is often erroneous. The same problem exists with the term "refresher". This study seeks to avoid the connotations of gentile euphemism and to employ the more clear and widely used broad meaning of the term,"Adult Basic Education".

The reference to Hartford in the title of the program means the City of Hartford. The programs discussed and evaluated are programs which are available to a citizen of the City of Hartford. This was the test applied to determine whether a specific program would be studied by this report, or not.

The primary goal of the research project has been to catalogue and describe existing programs in the city of Hartford. Programs have been functioning and are projected for the city, under funding from the federal government, the state, the city, private agencies, business and industry, and under voluntary auspices.

The second consideration for the project has been a summary evaluation of programs currently operative. The methods employed in their evaluation will be described later.

Both foci of the study will hopefully have direct operational relevance to those agencies operating programs currently. The utility of the study is many fold. The study provides:

1.) an aid to CAMPS committee in coordination and planning

2.) dissemination of data concerning programs to administrators, teachers, and students involved in program operation and planning

3.) direct data on evaluation of specific programs to aid in program effectiveness and restructure

4.) a city-wide overview of adult remedial education not before available

5.) a resource of referral for community leaders and counselors

6.) assistance to major sponsors in terms of overall and comparative effectiveness of their component programs

7.) a survey of relevant current research concerned with problems similar to Hartford's in the area of adult basic education

8.) findings and conclusions which can help direct the city's efforts to provide significant

INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH THE FOLLOWING:

William Asevedo	Camouinos
Richard Baldauf	Hartford Insurance Group
Robert Barrett	N.A.B.
Steve Berman	Community Renewal Team
Barbara Chamberlain	N.A.B.
Lois Colli	Connecticut General Life Insurance
Lloyd Cordwell	Concentrated Employment Program
Gordon Darkenwald	Columbia University
Jackie Dantzler	Learn Baby Learn
Claude Davis	Concentrated Employment Program
Council Dixson	Urban League
Jim Dorsey	State Department of Education
Joseph Dyer	State Department of Employment Services
Mary Fanning	Travelers Insurance Company
Zolton Feuerman	United Aircraft Training Center
James Fitzgerald	M.D.T.A.
Marilyn W. Grant	University of Hartford/New Careers
Ward Hickey	Connecticut Bank & Trust Company
Sandra Jibrell	Hartford National Bank
Richard Kelly	Hartford Board of Education
Stanley Kokoska	M.D.T.A.
Raleigh Lewis	Concentrated Employment Program
Alejandro Laluz	Concentrated Employment Program
Joseph Lenihan	Southern New England Telephone Company

Jean Livingston	Revitalization Corps
Dewey McGowen	Migrant Workers Program
Phil Morrow	Poor People's Federation
Lura Mudgett	Aetna Life and Casualty Company
Gail Norman	Saint Francis Hospital
Floyd Plymouth	Community Renewal Team
Louis Rabinow	Commission on Higher Education
Richard Rangoon	Utility Development
John Reagan	Concentrated Employment Program
Adrienne Reeves	Travelers Insurance Group
John Russell	Hartford Insurance Group
Earl Shepherd	South Arsenal Neighborhood Development
Mark Sauer	Community Renewal Team
Don Summers	Career Opportunities Program
John Spiro	State Department of Corrections
Herbert Sutton	Saint Michael's Church
Paul Taylor	University of Connecticut/Continuing Education
Michael Thomas	Hartford Hospital
Harris Thompson	Urban League
Beatrice Tinty	M.D.T.A.
Robert Walsh	Neighborhood Youth Corps
James Wilcox	State Department of Corrections

PROJECTS NOT EVALUATED

Career Opportunity Program

Connecticut Dept. of Employment Service

Hartford Hospital

Migrant Workers

N.A.B. - J.O.B.S.

Poor people's Federation

Revitalization Corps.

St. Francis Hospital

St. Michael's Church

South Arsenal Neighborhood Development

Southern New England Telephone Company

Urban League

University of Connecticut Continuing Education Service

Y.M.C.A.

PROJECTS EVALUATED

Aetna Life and Casualty

Concentrated Employment Program

Connecticut Bank and Trust

Connecticut General Life Insurance Company

Hartford Board of Education

Hartford Group

Hartford National Bank

Learn Baby Learn

M.D.T.A.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

New Careers

Project Most (Travelers Insurance)

United Aircraft Training

II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Although no program of the dimension and particular focus of this present study has been undertaken in any other American city, several studies in the recent literature bear upon the problems herein discussed. The following summation of studies are presented with a hope to be helpful to this end.

The most complete nation-wide study to date was conducted in 1966 by the National Basic Education Teacher Training Program, through the National University Extension Association. These studies showed that twenty four million Americans over the age of 18 have completed less than eight grades of school, eleven million Americans over 18 have completed less than six grades of schooling. Tests on these two populations show that grade levels tend to be higher than actual levels of performance.

The population of Connecticut is 2.2% illiterate as opposed to the national average of 2.4%. The following further conclusions were drawn:

1.) There are few (less than 15%) teachers in Adult Basic Education who are formally trained, but those who do teach in adult programs tend to be more highly credentialed than the average of public school teachers.

2.) Some specific orientation to the needs of adult students is highly desirable for teachers.

3.) There had been substantial yearly increase in the number and types of Adult Basic Education programs available for the past decade.

4.) Communication between towns/cities offering Adult Basic Education programs is greater than in most public school programs.

5.) Universities are generally ill-equipped to offer, super-

vise, or follow-up programs of adult education, especially when funding is not available.

6.) Programmed instruction and texts specifically geared to adult level are sparce.

In studying the learning disabilities of the disadvantaged adult the study found: 1.) A lack of self-confidence, 2.) Fear of School, 3.) The need to survive due to poverty, 4.) Below average Social and Intellectual Skills. (NOTE: It is necessary to realize of course, that existing tests concerned with No. 4 above are culture biased.)

The following learning patterns of adults in basic education were isolated:

1.) Adults tend to require more structure in learning, are more rigid.

2.) Adult "learning pace" is slower.

3.) Adults have low tolerance of irrelevant material.

4.) Adults need to structure and plan their own study time facilities (e.g., adequate light).

5.) Adults work better in a comfortable, relaxed setting.

6.) Adults express difficulty in remembering isolated facts.

7.) Disadvantaged adults suffer greatly from a lifetime of "being deprived of success".

8.) Adults are motivated by the usefulness of the material studied.

9.) Adult responsibility competes with time spent in study.

10.) Adult lack of interest is immediately translated into poor attendance.

11.) Adults are often physically and emotionally weary by class time.

12.) Adult education classes span a wide range of background and intelligence.

A 1968 study of counselors working with Adult Basic Education students offered some of the positive attributes of enrollees in Adult Basic Education programs. The following seventeen item list is arranged in descending order of strength of response:

1.) Want people who are receptive to them, who they can talk too

2.) To be a responsibile person in the community

3.) To start from scratch without fear

4.) To be left alone and unharrassed

5.) To be respected

6.) To be able to give their side of the story at all times

7.) To help others

8.) To learn

9.) To work

10.) To work with team type class

11.) To be understood

12.) They are willing to fight for truth and honesty

13.) They understand everyday problems

14.) They want to know if they are doing what they are best qualified for

15.) They want to know their capabilities for job entry and education

16.) Job orientation courses

17.) More team type classses

Many studies conducted through the past five years have found highly positive results with institutes for teachers of Adult Basic Education students. There are recognizable differences in the adult student population. Discussion and exposure to these differences

has been demonstrated to provide better teaching in programs. Interestingly, pre-tests and post-tests of students of teachers with extensive training indicate that highly trained specialists seem to be no more effective than teachers who have been sensitized to adult problems in education. The students of both highly trained teachers and teachers with some training perform significantly better than students of teachers with no training.

Composite analyses of studies descriptive of disadvantaged adults in education suggest that the following attributes are often present:

1.) Culturally deprived persons fear schools, libraries, museums and see them as foreign and threatening.

2.) Values do not emphasize high education, but work.

3.) Motivation weakens due to acceptance of standing in life.

4.) Sensitivity is uncommonly great to non-verbal communication. Judgements of teachers and Adult Basic Education staff are made on action rather than words.

5.) There are serious mental blocks related to fear of learning ability.

6.) Intellignece varies greatly.

7.) Little value is placed on long-range planning.

8.) There exists hostility to authority.

9.) Enrollees try hard to hide illiteracy.

Findings of several studies suggest that programs achieve more when they are flexible enough to adapt to the needs of enrollees rather than being so structured that they force enrollees to adapt to programs. Programs which involve enrollees in development and planning show greater gains than programs which do not do so.

A 1968 study of the educational needs and background of the Spanish speaking community in Hartford was published through the State Department of Continuing Education with funding from the Hartford Board of Education. The study sought to establish a base of need for the Spanish Learning Center (later Comoninos). Its findings were:

1.) 4.71% of the sample of 106 completed high school.

2.) 54% of the sample does not speak English.

3.) 56% do not write English.

4.) 48% do not read Spanish well.

5.) 59.45% came to Hartford within the past five years.

6.) 13.22% had taken night courses.

7.) 43% of the above studied three months or less.

8.) 39% of those surveyed preferred homestudy to school, study at work or at a center.

9.) Transportation and child care were the two major impediments to study mentioned.

Finally, several studies of late have challenged anew the downward thrust of most programs in adult basic education. The argument suggests that white middle class America which dictates the dimension and scope of such programs is far from qualified to do so.

These articles range from vitriolic militant indictments to carefully documented studies and examples of the inappropriateness of the program. The insensitivity of the ignorant and the catastrophic good intentions of the well-meaning and incompetent. There is agreement that a citi en in this time and in this nation needs basic skills of literacy and computation if he is to relate to the mainstream

culture. Questions posed are: Does he need to relate to the self-proclaimed "superior culture"? Does he need to study "honky" literature or propaganda? Does he need the collective guilt of the foreign white middle class to spread the habits of knowledge and the genus of skill before the "less fortunate than we"?

III

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS NOT EVALUATED

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD
500 WOODLAND STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
527-2527
DON SUMMERS - DIRECTOR

The program serves paraprofessionals employed by the Hartford Board of Education and is co-sponsored by the University of Hartford. Because the program began operation first in June of 1970, no clear data could be gathered for evaluation.

The Career Opportunities Program serves 95 persons from target areas under federal guidelines. During the current summer two programs functioned: one in which students took "Refresher Courses" for basic study and college study skills work; a second program offered students opportunity for standard collegiate course study or special course sections designed solely for C.O.P. students.

Students had an opportunity to participate actively in the planning of the Refresher program. Strong counseling services were offered by the Director, and staff for the courses was drawn from the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences at the university.

Students will be eligible for participation for four years while they continue full-time work at the Hartford Board of Education. Programs for each student are determined in consultation with the Director. Work done at the university should relate directly to the work done by the paraprofessionals in daily classroom duties.

CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
200 FOLLY BROOK BOULEVARD
WETHERSFIELD, CONNECTICUT
566-4298
JOSEPH DYER - DIRECTOR

The Connecticut State Employment Service does not conduct basic education programs per se. The department, however, offers a wide variety of supportive services to enrollees and education sub-contractors throughout the State. The department supports and encourages contractors for adult adult basic education.

HARTFORD HOSPITAL
EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY
JEFFERSON STREET
524-2666
MICHAEL THOMAS

Hartford Hospital has recently finished a first year program which is the pilot for future programs designed for entry level employees.

The program is for poverty level employees who wish to receive a High School equivalency diploma. Eight people, predominantly black, took the course in its first year. The Hartford Board of Education sponsors this Hartford Hospital funded program. The only cost for the Hospital is $3 per test, $2 for re-test, and $2 per diploma. The Hospital runs this program with people who are already members of the staff. The one teacher in the program is credentialed.

An ad is placed in the Hospital paper to recruit for the program. If the enrollment is large enough, a pre-course course will be offered. Requirements for eligibility are 18 years of age, and 6 months residency in Connecticut.

Geometry, Literature, Science and Social Studies are some of the areas covered. If enough Spanish speaking people enroll, an English course will be offered to them. This is proposed for October.

45% of the students pass the test, this is a significant means of program evaluation. Because the program has graduated so small a sample, detailed evaluation is not possible.

MIGRANT WORKERS PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD
WATKINSON ANNEX
BLOOMFIELD AVENUE
WEST HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
233-3849
DEWEY MCGOWEN - DIRECTOR

The Migrant Workers Program does not provide basic education for adults. The program was not evaluated for this reason. The program is designed primarily for young children under 13 years of age. The adults of the transient community are served by this program in the capacity of a referral agency. If the parents of a child are deficient in some phase of education and are motivated to begin study, the Migrant Workers Program refers them to an appropriate agency. Most referrals are for non-English Speaking parents desirous of acquiring English language skills.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN - JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN THE BUSINESS SECTOR
243 FARMINGTON AVENUE
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
249-5241
ROBERT BARRETT - DIRECTOR

The goal of the N.A.B. - J.O.B.S. Program is the training and hiring of hard-core unemployed and the disadvantaged. Descriptive program information is sent out to area employers explaining the advantages of hiring disadvantaged unemployed members of the community. Once the employer feels he can accept some of the trainees, N.A.B. recruits candidates for the positions. Several area employers have their own training centers, smaller businesses send the trainees to these larger training centers (e.g., United Aircraft Corporation). The cost of this training is paid for by the Department of Labor, the funding agency for the N.A.B. program. All training costs incurred by the employer above and beyond the usual employee training costs normally expected for the position, are absorbed by the N.A.B. contract.

Ninety-eight percent of the people involved in the program are from minority groups, of these, ninety percent are male.

The upgrading program cannot last more than 18 months. The enrollees are recruited through the Concentrated Employment Program and the Employment Services.

Four hundred and thirty-two people are currently enrolled in the N.A.B. program which served seven hundred and forty-eight people in the last year. Approximately eight percent of these people were Spanish Speaking. The actual cost per enrollee is about $2,000. The courses offered deal with job-related education, orientation to the world of work, counseling, and on-the-job training. The reason this program is not evaluated is because it is an agency of referral and administration rather than an educational

agency. N.A.B. sponsors programs, but does not actually operate any educative services. Some of the other evaluated programs are sponsored by N.A.B.

The introductory literature published by N.A.B., literature designed to attract business and industrial participation, emphasizes the great economic burden of the poor, their cost in taxes, and their value as workers. Area businesses and industries lend executives from their own staff to aid in bringing the N.A.B. - J.O.B.S. program to more Hartford businesses and industries.

POOR PEOPLE'S FEDERATION
1491 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
278-7570
PHIL MORROW - DIRECTOR

The Poor People's Federation runs a program designed to place people in jobs and to keep them there through supportive services. This program reaches people in designated target areas, and seeks to serve the hard core unemployed and underemployed.

The program uses a system of coaches. Coaches are volunteers or successful trainees. It is the job of the coach to accompany and support the prospective employee, and even go to the interview with him if this is possible (the employer determines the extent to which the coach may participate).

The job market is currently in such a state that this program is not meeting the success it would really like to. Rising unemployment in Connecticut is especially hurtful to the unskilled. The Concentrated Employment Program contracts Poor People's Federation to recruit for C.E.P. and coach for the first 90 days the employee is on the job.

REVITALIZATION CORPS
ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM
1762 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
249-7523
ED POLSDOFER - DIRECTOR

The goal of the program is to enable the adults in the program to pass the G.E.D. exam and obtain a high school equivalency certificate. The teaching is done in one of two locations. Students are either tutored in their homes at mutually agreed upon times, or are of the small group who are tutored during their lunch hour at Travelers Insurance Company. All teachers are college graduates but are not necessarily trained to be teachers. None are full-time in the program —all are volunteers. They are not specially recruited but enter through the regular recruitment programs for volunteers by the Corps. Since the Revitalization Corps is an entirely voluntary organization, all time and materials are donated.

Adult students are not really recruited but come and seek the service or are referred to the Corps by other agencies who are aware of the program. Funding for the Corps depends entirely on private donations and is therefore somewhat unsure at any given time.

SAINT FRANCIS HOSPITAL
114 WOODLAND STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
249-5279
GAIL NORMAN - PERSONNEL ASSISTANT

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

	M	F	T
NO. OF ENROLLEES: (Current)	5	5	10
(1969-1970)	-	-	-

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: 5

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: N.A.

FUNDING: Saint Francis

SPONSORSHIP: Saint Francis

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1

NO. OF TEACHERS: 2

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 0

ANNUAL BUDGET: N.A.

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: N.A.

COST PER ENROLLEE: N.A.

BASIC SKILLS PROGRAM

	M	F	T
NO. OF ENROLLEES: (Current)	-	-	29
(1969-1970)	-	-	—

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: N.A.

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: N.A.

FUNDING: Saint Francis

SPONSORSHIP: Saint Francis

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1

NO. OF TEACHERS: 2

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 0

ANNUAL BUDGET: N.A.

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: Math - $9
Reading - $11

COST PER ENROLLEE: N.A.

The program, functional since April, 1970, seeks to upgrade employees of Saint Francis Hospital by providing three course offerings: American English: Conversation and Grammar (for Spanish Speaking), Tools for Living I (Language Arts and Basic Math), Tools for Living II (Math). The program is jointly funded by the hospital and the Hartford Board of Education. The Board pays the two full-time teachers and some expenses for textbooks. The hospital provides administration funds, space, and work incentives.

The courses for Spanish Speaking use four levels of E.S.L. No expansion is planned in the current year, but a successful operation will lend to the possibility of expansion in 1971.

NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
SAINT MICHAEL'S CHURCH
5 CLARK STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
522-0277
HERBERT SUTTON - DIRECTOR

This community based program offers G.E.D. preparation and adult language classes for the Spanish Speaking as well as practical skill classes and black history. The staff is primarily voluntary and in-service training is offered only to summer tutors.

Recruitment is by word of mouth and the program offers assistance to enrollees in the areas of housing and job placement. Enrollees tend to be one half Black, one half Spanish.

The program enjoys the advantages of volunteer staffing and suffers its disadvantages. Volunteer tutors are enthusiastic and offer friendship and encouragement; yet dependability is often a problem and the volunteers are often unskilled in the techniques and materials of instruction. Attempts are being made to train indigenous community personnel to be tutors in a peer-to-peer program.

SOUTH ARSENAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (S.A.N.D.)
45 CANTON STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
278-8460
EARL SHEPARD - EDUCATION COORDINATOR

At the present time the South Arsenal Neighborhood Development does not have an educational program which serves the adults of the community. The energies of the program are currently being directed towards youth. The Everywhere School, an innovative school located in an abandoned warehouse, is the prime example of S.A.N.D.'s child orientated programs. The Everywhere School is a highly flexible, child-centered experiment in community education.

S.A.N.D. is currently in the process of developing a program to serve the needs of adults and drop-outs. As yet, there are no classes in existence, but it is hoped that the program can begin shortly.

SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY (SNETCO)
ESSENTIAL EDUCATION SKILLS PROGRAM
55 TRUMBULL STREET
247-9221
JOSEPH LENIHAN - AREA EMPLOYMENT SUPERVISOR

	M	F	T
NO. OF ENROLLEES: (Current)	4	0	4
(1969-1970)	-	-	-

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: 0

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: Poverty

FUNDING: N.A.B. - J.O.B.S.
Department of Labor

SPONSORSHIP: SNETCO

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1

NO. OF TEACHERS: 1

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 2

ANNUAL BUDGET: N.A.

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: Paid

COST PER ENROLLEE: $2064 (Includes salary)

This new program sponsored by Southern New England Telephone Company in conjunction with N.A.B. - J.O.B.S. is now in its fifteenth week of a twenty week cycle. The object of the program is to give job mobility to employees, and to train poverty level people to be installers and linemen. There are four male black enrollees at present. Three other enrollees have dropped out of the program, two blacks and one white man. N.A.B. reimburses the telephone company $2064 per employee.

The staff is recruited through the University of Hartford and consists of one teacher for the first nine weeks. The courses are: reading, spelling, English, theory of numbers, and math for home and business. A coach from the Poor People's Federation aids the person through the entire program. After the first nine weeks the remedial portion is finished and on-the-job training begins. Two foremen contribute to this phase of training. Enrollees are poverty level persons recruited by P.P.F. and C.E.P. The program is dependent on economic conditions. The current unemployment rate is a hindrance. Three twenty week cycles are planned for the future.

PROJECT MATTHEWS
URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER HARTFORD
175 ENFIELD STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
522-8163
DIRECTORSHIP VACANT

The Urban League Program will be designed to help high school drop-outs achieve the motivation and opportunity to finish high school. Poverty level income people will be eligible for the program at no charge to the enrollee. The selection of the enrollees will be based on personal interviews with the candidates, and the results of programmed testing. When a candidate has been selected, the project aims to improve the areas of basic weakness which have been exposed through the interviews and tests through remedial instruction.

The program last operated one year ago. During that time 150 students were served (98 males, 52 females). Sixteen of these people were Spanish Speaking (10 males, 6 females). Seventy five percent of the students were black, 24% Puerto Rican and 1% white.

When the program again becomes operational, the director will be the only administrator. There will be 8 teachers and 8 supportive personnel. These will consist of 1 social worker, 1 team leader, and 6 counselor-recruiters. All of the staff will be full-time.

The cash budget of Project Matthews is $60,000 per year.

The program will be based exclusively in the North End of Hartford. It is hoped that eventually the program can be extended throughout the city.

The reason this program was not evaluated is that this program is currently in the process of re-organizing, and is presently waiting to be funded before any action can or will be taken. Data on previous programs would not be applicable to the proposed re-structuring of the program.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT CONTINUING EDUCATION SERVICES
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
HARTFORD BRANCH
1280 ASYLUM AVENUE
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
523-4841
PAUL TAYLOR - EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST

Anyone desiring to further his or her education is eligible for the University of Connecticut Continuing Education Services. A high school diploma is not a prerequisite, courses are offered both for college credit and for non-credit.

This self-supporting program has courses which cost anywhere from $0 to the enrollee to $125 for a computer technology course. The course for which there is no charge is a "certification in social service course". This course is funded through the Commission on Aid to Higher Education under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The classes each meet ten times, every Wednesday from 7:00 - 9:00P.M.

The staff is recruited or volunteer to teach in the program. None of the teachers is full-time. The enrollees are recruited via a news release which advertises the courses offered.

The typical student is white, age 35, middle class, and female. The student is required to purchase his or her own books.

The reason we did not evaluate this program is that it does not deal in the area of remedial education. Courses offered are: real estate and insurance, reading acceleration and comprehension (an improvement course), managerial processes, technical writing, metallurgy, and many others.

In the future a consolidated full-time program would be desired to meet the growing needs of the people served.

YMCA
315 PEARL STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
522-4183

The Hartford YMCA offers a one week course (August 24-28, 1970) titled "How to Study in College". The classes are held at the University of Hartford, 200 Bloomfield Avenue, West Hartford, Connecticut from 7:00-9:00P.M. The cost of the course is $23 for members of the YMCA and $25 for non-members. The instructor is Dr. Worman L. Trusty, Associate Professor at Purdue University.

The course is not remedial, but is designed to promote a positive transition from high school to college. The course could prove to be of interest to Hartford adults planning to begin college work either full or part time. 75% of the course deals with basic study skills while the remaining 25% deals with college adjustment. This course is part of a national program which served 5,000 students in 1969. It is the only course in the area of fundamental education offered by the Hartford YMCA.

IV

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS EVALUATED

OPERATION START
AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY COMPANY
195 FARMINGTON AVENUE
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
273-3920
LURA MUDGETT - DIRECTOR

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T
(Current)	4	10	14
(1969-1970)	4	31	35

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: 11

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: Poverty

FUNDING: Aetna Life & Casualty (N.A.B.)

SPONSORSHIP:

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1

NO. OF TEACHERS: 8

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 1

ANNUAL BUDGET: $100,000

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None

COST PER ENROLLEE: $1950 - $3200
(Including Salary)

CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
REMEDIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
3580 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
278-9950 EXT. 346
RALEIGH LEWIS - C.E.P. DIRECTOR

This Community Renewal Team program seeks to find employment for poverty area people and to support them in those jobs. The C.E.P. is a career ladder program involving both vasic education teaching and vocational training. Recruitment is through P.P.F. and walk-in referrals. Testing and job suitability profiles assist in placement for jobs. Enrollees do not participate in planning the program.

CONNECTICUT BANK & TRUST COMPANY
38 LEWIS STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
244-4312
WARD HICKEY - DIRECTOR

	M	F	T
NO. OF ENROLLEES: (Current)	5	15	20
(1969-1970)	-	-	-

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 10

NO. OF TEACHERS: 2

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: 20-25

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 2

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: N.A.

ANNUAL BUDGET: $400,000

FUNDING: Connecticut Bank & Trust

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None

SPONSORSHIP: Connecticut Bank

COST PER ENROLLEE: $5200 (Includes Salary)

The Connecticut Bank & Trust Company program seeks to provide support and education for employees in entry level positions. The following chart describes the type of positions toward which the program can train.

AREAS	NUMBER TRAINED 1969	1970 (first 6 months)	INSTRUCTION HOURS 1969	1970
Teller	119	55	5330	2985
Proof Trainees	56	22	3618	1227
Overall Disadvantaged	14	25	5929	5663
Supervisory	102	39	6958	863
College	29	-	1775	-
Summer College	19	-	199	-
Listening Skills	71	-	370	-
Keypunch	-	7	-	264
Secretarial Skills	-	8	-	295
Orientation	-	180	-	556
Corporation Development	-	13	-	585
Head Teller	-	8	-	96
Alcohol & Drugs	-	29	-	307

CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY
JOB TRAINING PROGRAM
900 COTTAGE GROVE ROAD
BLOOMFIELD, CONNECTICUT
242-4422
LOIS COLLI - TEACHING ASSISTANT

	M	F	T
NO. OF ENROLLEES: (Current)	5	15	20
(1969-1970)	-	-	-

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: N.A.

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: Poverty

FUNDING: Department of Labor

SPONSORSHIP: Connecticut General, N.A.B.

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1

NO. OF TEACHERS: 2

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 1 full-time
1 part-time

ANNUAL BUDGET: $183,000 (N.A.B.)

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None

COST PER ENROLLEE: N.A.

JOB TRAINING PROGRAM
CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY
900 COTTAGE GROVE ROAD
BLOOMFIELD, CONNECTICUT
242-4422
LOIS COLLI - TEACHING ASSISTANT

This N.A.B. funded program for 75 persons is an 18 month program. Instruction is individualized and teaching staff is not trained or certified. The program prefers to employ community based personnel rather than professionally trained teachers.

HARTFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
HARTFORD ADULT SCHOOL
249 HIGH STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
527 - 4191 EXT. 269
RICHARD F. KELLY - DIRECTOR

The Hartford Board of Education essentially conducts two programs in adult remediation: the Adult Basic Education Program which is jointly funded by federal, state, and city government, and the Hartford Adult School which is city funded. Far more detailed statistical data is available on the former due in large part to the need of the detailed reports necessary to validate use of state and federal funding.

The two programs differ because their goals, operation, and funding differ. The Board program is unique in the city in that it teaches a full 81% of adults in school in Hartford. 53.7% of the responses for this study came from the Board Programs. For this reason we have when significant, separated some statistics in categories: Board of Education/non-Board of Education.

In order to complete the following data, it was necessary because of the pure volume of the program, to spend much time in scrutiny of records, in class visitations, and in staff interviews. The Board staff and particularly the director of the programs were most generous and open in providing necessary data and support over a several week period.

A comparison was made between the varied offerings of the Hartford Board in the area of adult education and of the offerings of neighboring suburban cities and towns. Adult education in the suburbs is defined in terms of home skill courses and special interest or general advancement studies. Basic Education is provided "when and if the need arises".

While Hartford does offer a scattering of home skill and general education

courses, the main thrust of the program in both Adult Basic Education and the Hartford Adult School programs is what may be termed core education, specifically designed toward educational and social mobility through language and mathematics and liberal arts.

The great difference between the programs of the Hartford Board and those of Boards of Education of neighboring towns must be recognized by readers of this report and funding agencies.

Another significant fact concerning adult programs of the Board is the dollar for dollar value given the tax payer in the programs. Because of a small administrational staff and careful expenditures of allotted funds, the Board's dollar buys more than in traditionally structured programs. The adult programs do, however, suffer from underfunding. Classes are too large; there is little money for in-service training; supportive services are weaker than they should be; follow-up is informal. The programs as the data following will suggest deserve a wider base of support.

Historically the failure of the public schools in America is a strong contributing cause to the problem of adult illiteracy and social stagnation. It is then consistent with the investment of democratic education in the public school, that the school Board should assume a major role of leadership in corrective education.

The Hartford Board in addition to the programs herein discussed offers English by television to the Spanish Speaking in the program, Ingles Para Todos, a half hour nationally designed and produced series. The program, of half hour duration appears on Channel 24, Hartford on Monday and Wednesday at 12:30P.M. and on Tuesday and Thursday at 7:30P.M. Programs are advertized on radio, television, newspapers, and on posters in Spanish Speaking districts. A textbook may be ordered for the course.

Courses are held in a variety of locations at Weaver, Bulkeley, and

Hartford Public High Schools, at Arsenal, Kinsella and Wish schools, at Mitchell House and Clay Hill House, and at the Daytime Adult School, 160 Main Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T
(Current)	-	-	1200
(1969-1970)	1120	1345	2465

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: 621 (Current)

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: N.A.

FUNDING: Title III, Act 89-750
City of Hartford
State of Connecticut

SPONSORSHIP: Hartford Board of Education

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1 full-time
3 part-time

NO. OF TEACHERS: 66 part-time

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 10 part-time

ANNUAL BUDGET: $193,000
(Excludes Overhead)

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None

COST PER ENROLLEE: $500

The Adult Basic Education Program is funded under Title III of Act 89-750 (1966) to the extent of 1/3 of its operating costs. State funding absorbs an additional 1/3 while the city pays the remaining 1/3. The program seeks an eighth grade competency from its enrollees. Subjects are taught ranging from language skills, reading and mathematics to Consumer Economics. The E.S.L. program is used. Staff is recruited from the full-time staff of the Board of Education, most staff have masters degrees and long teaching experience. The program works with State agencies and its own counseling staff to provide supportive services. Yet several enrollees interviewed were unaware of the availability of these services and had not received them.

Recruitment is chiefly through word of mouth, newspaper advertizing, brochures, television, and Board employees are also employed. It is difficult to assess what percentage of the population desirous of such a program is not reached by any of these devices. There exists no community based organized campaign of recruiting, no directed attempt to recruit Spanish Speaking through indigenous community leadership.

HARTFORD ADULT SCHOOL PROGRAM

NO. OF ENROLLEES: M F T
(Current) - - 200
(1969-1970) - - 2500

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: N.A.

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: N.A.

FUNDING: City of Hartford

SPONSORSHIP: Hartford Board of Education

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1 full-time
3 part-time

NO. OF TEACHERS: 112 part-time

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 6 part-time

ANNUAL BUDGET: $150,000
(Excludes Overhead)

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None
(Resident)

COST PER ENROLLEE: $30 per Credit

The program is totally city sponsored and funded. Its goal is a high school diploma for enrollees.

There are two means for an adult to gain a high school diploma. One is by gaining a specified number of course credits in high school subjects, the other is through G.E.D. examinations which provide a state sponsored equivalency route. Counseling is offered students as to which means is more suitable for the individual student. The Board supervises both tracks.

Staff is again recruited from the day staff of the Board and tends to be highly credentialed and experienced. Little in-service training is offered. In the past 20 years over 1500 students have received diplomas directly from the Hartford Adult School.

The staff of the program does not have sufficient contact with the student in his environment. No significant formal follow-up is offered. Liason with State agencies is insufficient. The greatest tragedy of this program is however that it is being seriously limited by cutbacks of funds due to Board directives.

HARTFORD INSURANCE GROUP
HARTFORD PLAZA
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
547-5379
JOHN RUSSELL - ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T	NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS:	1
(Current)	-	-	225		
(1969-1970)	-	-	450	NO. OF TEACHERS:	3
NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING:	N.A.			NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF:	N.A.
MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL:	N.A.			ANNUAL BUDGET:	$35,000
FUNDING:	N.A.B.			EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE:	None
SPONSORSHIP:	Hartford Insurance Group			COST PER ENROLLEE:	$64.00

This is a N.A.B. sponsored program.

HARTFORD NATIONAL BANK & TRUST COMPANY
777 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
547-4219
SANDRA JIBRELL - DIRECTOR

	M	F	T
NO. OF ENROLLEES: (Current)	-	8	8
(1969-1970)	-	30	30

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 1

NO. OF TEACHERS: 5

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: None

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: N.A.

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: $5000 or less

ANNUAL BUDGET: $66,000

FUNDING: N.A.B.

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None

SPONSORSHIP: Hartford National Bank

COST PER ENROLLEE: $2222 (Including Salary)

The Hartford National Bank program operates under a N.A.B. contract and utilizes the facilities of the United Aircraft Training Center. Positions available presently are: clerk and proof machine operator.

LEARN BABY LEARN
72 SEYMS STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
527-1725
JOHN SPIRO - DIRECTOR

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T
(Current)	-	-	-
(1969-1970)	75	-	75

NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING: 10

MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL: N.A.

FUNDING: Washington, D.C./ H.E.W.

SPONSORSHIP: Department of Corrections

NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS: 2 part-time

NO. OF TEACHERS: 5

NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF: 1

ANNUAL BUDGET: $200,000

EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE: None

COST PER ENROLLEE: $800-900

The Learn Baby Learn program is the education component of the Department of Corrections in Hartford. Enrollees who volunteer for the training program are inmates over 21 years old and have a minimum of 45 days remaining in their sentences. The program follows nine week cycles.

The grant supporting the program has been generous in providing physical equipment and paraprofessional support. Indigenous long term inmates are employed as paraprofessionals in the program.

The primary goal is achievement of a successful G.E.D. grade which both aids in the process of rehabilitation and in securing a job upon release.

The program offers orientation and on-going training of teaching staff. In addition to math and English skills training, enrollees participate in a "Social Living" course which seeks to bring about "self-awareness and self-realization". The program does not, however, offer any follow-up upon release. This would seem to be a serious difficulty.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING ACT SKILLS CENTER
122 WASHINGTON STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
278-1130
STANLEY KOKOSKA - DIRECTOR

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T	NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS:	2
(Current)	40%	60%	130		
(1969-1970)	-	-	50	NO. OF TEACHERS:	13
NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING:	45%			NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF:	1
MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL:	Poverty			ANNUAL BUDGET:	$94,250
FUNDING:	H.E.W.			EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE:	None
SPONSORSHIP:	State Department of Education			COST PER ENROLLEE:	$1.60 (Salary per Hour)

Enrollees are poverty level persons referred and later placed by the State Employment Service, Concentrated Employment Program, or the Work Incentive Program. After a three week orientation and evaluation session, instruction concerns either remedial or skill training courses. A specialized track for the Spanish Speaking emphasizes English language skills.

The State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the State Department of Welfare, together with cooperating agencies offer supportive services. A high rate of job placement lends strength to the program, but follow-up is not built in and the director himself feels the need of a built-in self-evaluation process.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS
REMEDIAL EDUCATION COMPONENT - OUT OF SCHOOL
1443 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
278-9950 EXT. 421
ROBERT WALSH - DIRECTOR

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T	NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS:	3
(Current)	40	50	90		
(1969-1970)	-	-	185	NO. OF TEACHERS:	2
NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING:	1/2			NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF:	4
MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL:	Poverty			ANNUAL BUDGET:	$15,000
FUNDING:	Department of Labor State Dept. of Community Affairs			EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE:	Students Paid
				COST PER ENROLLEE:	$123
SPONSORSHIP:	Community Renewal Team Hartford Board of Education				

The program is aimed at recent high school drop-outs who are encouraged to continue their education in a less formal, less structured, less intimidating setting than the traditional in-school setting.

Students are paid while attending school and most of the education is remedial in nature seeking to make the youths employable.

Average Students - Age 16-17
9.2 Years in School
Grade 4.2 Functional Reading
Grade 6 Functional Math

Those with greatest need are given preference. This is the only program discussed in the report which not only does not "cream" its candidates but which gives absolute preference to those most deficient in skills taught. E.S.L. programs are offered the Spanish Speaking.

No in-service program for teachers exists. Field supervisors offer counseling while the students are attending class and also after job placement. A follow-up is then made of the enrollees. Follow-up studies

indicate:

58% Job Placement (through 90 days at least)

12% Further Training (M.D.T.A., etc.)

15% Return to School

15% Terminate with No Plans

Nationally, hopes for this program are limited due to a change of emphasis wherein public and private education is being supported in attempts to remedy conditions which cause drop-outs to leave school. In the meantime efforts are being made to improve the effectiveness of Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

PROJECT MOST
TRAVELERS INSURANCE COMPANY
GROVE STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
277-0111 EXT. 6441
ADRIENNE REEVES - COORDINATOR

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T	NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS:	1
(Current)	-	24	24		
(1969-1970)	-	24	24	NO. OF TEACHERS:	4
NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING:	2			NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF:	N.A.
MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL:	Poverty			ANNUAL BUDGET:	$5180
FUNDING:	Urban League, Travelers Insurance			EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE:	None
SPONSORSHIP:	Urban League Travelers Insurance			COST PER ENROLLEE:	$518

Of all programs considered in this report, Project Most is the most carefully conceived, best equipped, and offers the widest supportive and follow-up services. The program is an eight week skill training and basic education program. The teacher/student ratio is one to six. Staff includes both professional teachers and experienced business personnel. Bi-lingual instruction is provided the Spanish Speaking.

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the program is the time offered staff for evaluation, program development, and enrollee follow-up. After each eight week session, a four week staff workshop/development session is in operation.

Recruitment is through the Urban League, word of mouth, and the company's personnel service which is alerted to the needs of potential enrollees. Enrollees participate in planning course work and are requested at various points following completion of the program to offer continuing evaluation.

Current plans for expansion include both increase of the number of

enrollees served and expansion of the training period from eight to ten weeks. The staff feels that the program has proved itself to top management and will expand not only in Hartford, but will be the base for a national Travelers program of personnel development.

Unquestionably, statistics and overall plan show this to be a highly successful model program. Funding and operation represent an admirable community business partnership. The development of effective career ladders is planned. The program, regrettably, is one of few adequately funded programs and is limited in the number it can serve.

UNITED AIRCRAFT TRAINING CENTER
3580 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
565-8032
ZOLTON FREERMAN - DIRECTOR

NO. OF ENROLLEES:	M	F	T	NO. OF ADMINISTRATORS:	5
(Current)	2	5	7		
(1969-1970)	65%	35%	282	NO. OF TEACHERS:	6
NO. OF SPANISH SPEAKING:	33%			NO. OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF:	N.A.
MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL:	Poverty			ANNUAL BUDGET:	N.A.
FUNDING:	United Aircraft Corp.			EXPENSE TO ENROLLEE:	None
SPONSORSHIP:	United Aircraft Corp.			COST PER ENROLLEE:	N.A.

United Aircraft Corporation, a holder of a N.A.B. contract maintains an educational center for its own enrollees and for N.A.B. enrollees of several other companies. The center offers both basic education and job skills training.

Programs function for varying numbers of weeks depending upon the needs of the sponsoring company. The center tailors programs to suit company and enrollee needs.

Recruitment is through advertizing and company personnel officers.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

THE SURVEY

A variety of correlated approaches was used in compiling data for the study. Three separate instruments were devised: one for administrators, one for teachers, one for enrollees. (See Appendices I, II, III, IIIA.)

The administrator evaluation form is primarily a data collection device. Questions relating to enumeration and description were asked as well as questions concerned with staff and curriculum development. Administrators were encouraged to self-evaluate their programs in terms of the program's stated goals.

The teacher questionnaire reflects concern for student differences and relevance of programs and curriculum. Teachers also were asked to evaluate both their own performances and overall program effectiveness.

The student information in this survey was to be obtained from three sources: in-class questionnaires, mailed questionnaires, and personal interviews. An initial goal of 20% of the total population was set.

The in-class sample was chosen by randomly selecting classes in session and quizzing all persons in each of these classes. (Whenever possible several classes were used to negate any effects that a particular teacher or subject matter would have on the students' overall evaluation of the program.) A sample for mailing was selected, using random number tables, from each program's enrollment records. The interviewed sample came from randomly choosing about 20% of the mailing list.

All program administrators were willing to share the information and to grant access to the data available. They cooperated enthusiastically with evaluation teams.

When all the data were obtained, it was analyzed as a whole and for each of the individual programs, as well as for the following groups of students:

a) male
b) female
c) foreign-born
d) age 16-19
e) age 20-29
f) age 30-39
g) age 40-49

This information from each questionnaire was coded twice and checked against one another to insure accuracy. Further checks were made on the tabulated data and the original questionnaire to insure no error.

Two particular problems arose in the returned questionnaires that necessitated individual attention. In some cases, particularly in classes where the student was perhaps hurried, a page of the questionnaire was overlooked. The three pages of the questionnaire are, however, independent of one another as far as types of questions posed. It was thus necessary only to consider the number of persons answering each page as the population for that series of questions. Another problem that unfortunately arose was the sorehead. On some of the questionnaires there was an obvious attempt made to make the program look bad by giving only the worst possible answers. For a program with a small enrollment, one such questionnaire could cause considerable damage. To combat this, any questionnaire which voiced opinions that were significantly worse than the norm was discarded. A total of six such questionnaires was discarded. Three other questionnaires were discarded. One was confused about what the questions meant; one was answering facetiously; and one was filled out by someone who had actually never taken courses in the program in question.

METHOD OF EVALUATION

To compare the relative excellence of two programs or the difference in opinion expressed by different segments of the population, it is necessary to devise a quantitative measure of the opinions expressed in the study. This measure must in some way concentrate the various answers (S.D., D., A., S.A.) of all elements of the sample into one or two numbers which express the sentiment of all the population.

Two approaches were used here -- both require the selections of a few questions from the instrument and the assignment of a numerical value to each of the possible responses to these questions. A value of two was assigned to each of the strong responses (S.A. and S.D.) while the weaker responses (A. and D.) were given a weighting factor of one. The questions from which IC1 and FP are determined are numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 13.

The sum of the negative values (S.D.'s and D.'s) and the sum of the positive values (S.A.'s and A.'s) for each of the nine questions were tabulated for all questionnaires in the sample. These figures were used to quantify the first half of the questionnaire (the more general part). For the second half of the questionnaire, the total number of checks in question 17 (considered positive responses) and the number of checks in question 18 (considered negative responses) were each tabulated. These will yield a measure of the second half of the instrument (the specific part).

The first measure calculated for both parts of the questionnaire will be called the Intensity Coefficient -- to be differentiated for the first and second parts of the questionnaire as IC1 and IC2 respectively -- so named because it tends to measure the fraction of total excess positive feelings voiced on the questionnaire as a whole.) Both IC1 and IC2 (See Table I) were calculated by subtracting the number of negative responses as described above

from the number of positive responses and dividing by the number obtained if all responses were assumed to be as positive as possible. For questions 17 and 18 this would be the total number of responses. For questions 1 - 13 two times the total number of responses would be used. Thus, coefficients can range from -1 to +1. A coefficient of zero would indicate that there is as much bad feeling as good about the program. Unfortunately, this measure has the drawback of treating a questionnaire that has, for example, 50 D.'s and 25 S.A.'s the same as one with 25 S.D.'s and 50 A.'s; in the first case there are twice as many people in disagreement as agreement and vice versa in the second. Another measure which is more sensitive to the number of people responding positively was needed.

The fraction of positive responses (FP) was calculated only for the first part of the questionnaire. Because the responses in the second half all have the same numerical value (i.e., one), the FP is a linear function of IC2 and thus would present no new insights. The coefficient (FP) was calculated by adding the numbers of S.A.'s and A.'s and dividing by the total number of responses. This, of course, does not differentiate between A. and S.A., but this is adequately done by IC1. The FP does, however, yield a reasonable measure of the number of favorable impressions of the given program.

These coefficients will be used to rank the individual groups with respect to one another. However, for a point-by-point comparison of a program with the Hartford mean, the discussion will (for the most part) center on the percentages of positive and negative responses to each question.

COMMENTS ON TECHNIQUE

The mailed sample was somewhat of a disappointment as a return of 15% - 20% was anticipated. The actual return came to only about one half that (see below).

	Total	Percent
Mailed	467	100
Undeliverable	50	11
Returned	41	9

As might be expected the highest percent undeliverable came from the Arsenal area while the lowest came from the suburban area (Wethersfield, Bloomfield, etc.)

Of the 88 personal interviews attempted 16 were completed successfully.

This was not too disappointing as it was necessary to make contact during working hours. Only one person contacted refused to cooperate.

The following were the coefficients obtained from both in-class sample and mail sample.

	IC1	IC2	FP
Total	.524	.522	.855
Mail	.508	.458	.861
Interview	.510	.620	.853

IC1 and FP are relatively stable but IC2 is a strong function of the amount of supervision. Since presumably more thought went into the mailed questionnaires, they should better represent the feelings of the persons sampled. The results presented here therefore must be considered slightly optimistic as in-class questionnaires composed the majority of the sample.

DISCUSSION OF THE WHOLE

The returned questionnaires in this study indicate that the average adult student is satisfied. Positive responses overall outweigh negative responses by a factor of about four to one. The number of answers of each type for the average questionnaire broke down approximately as follows:

Questions 1 - 13
- S.D. - 0.5
- D. - 1.8
- A. - 5.7
- S.A. - 4.0
- Did Not Respond - 0.9

Question 17 - 3.6

Question 18 - 1.1

The highest responses on questions 1 - 13 (see Table 2) of the questionnaire were given for the questions concerning the teachers' abilities. These four questions (9, 10, 11, and 12) all received positive replies of over 80%. The question concerning impact (i.e., reading, helping with homework) ranked second as far as positive responses were recorded. Unfortunately the questions which measure the student's attitude toward what he has gained from the program were not higher. The responses for these three questions (1, 2, and 13) ranged from 64% to 82% indicating the students have reservations as to the applicability of what they have learned.

Thirty-seven percent found the work more difficult than they had anticipated. However, in answering question 18h only 12% thought this to be one of the worst things about the program.

In question 17 (see Table 20) the students rated the things

they got most from the program in order as:

Knowledge
Feeling I Could Do More
Satisfaction
Wider Interests
Better Reading Ability
Good Friends
Better Job
Salary Increase
Other

In question 18 the following order of results was obtained:

Confusion
Too Difficult
Poor Materials and Books
Bad Location of Class
Other Students
Unimportant Subjects
Poor Physical Facilities
Poor Teaching
Lack of Availability

The last two questions (19 and 20) were answered by only about one-half of the students. Of those answering, 38% reported getting a better job and 48.4% were dissatisfied with their present jobs.

MALE vs FEMALE

There were some differences in the way the men and women approached the questionnaire. The men answered more of the questions in the first part while the women were more likely to comment on the second part. The distribution of answers on the first part of the questionnaire was fairly uniform except that the women tended to check more S.A.'s than did the men (see Tables 3 and 4). On question 17 (see Table 20) the women answered 3% more frequently while on question 18, they answered about 12% more frequently. There, however, was no appreciable difference in any of the three coefficients (see Table 1).

On question 1 the men answered more positively that they used directly what they had learned. Sixteen percent of the women failed to answer this question. More men than women also felt they had learned the things that were most important. Surprisingly, the number of men who disagreed that they had received all from the studies that they had hoped was considerably larger than the number of women. Although the number who agreed with this question was the same from both groups.

In the second half of the questionnaire the women more frequently checked "wider interests" as one of the things they got most from the program. The men were more critical of the teachers' abilities (question 18c) than were the women. Since no evidence of a greater dissatisfaction was voiced by the men in questions 4 and 5, it must be assumed that there are factors other than the teacher's knowledge and ability to explain that are affecting the

men.

A significantly higher percentage of women complained about the location of the classes -- a fact no doubt due to a lack of access to personal transportation.

There was a substantial difference in attitudes of the men and women toward questions 19 and 20. Of the men answering, 30% reported getting a better job while only 42% were satisfied with their present jobs. Of the women 43% thought they had gotten a better job because of their participation but 55% were satisfied with their present jobs.

Special attention should be called to the 1968 report supportive of the Learning Center concept. The report was issued by the Office of Continuing Studies, State of Connecticut and addresses itself more directly to the following data.

FOREIGN BORN

In questions 1 - 13 the number of strong answers recorded for this group is about the same as for the average. There is a difference, however, in the distribution of the more moderate (A and D) replies (see Table 9). There is a proportionately larger number of "Agrees" and a correspondingly smaller number of "Disagrees". As a result, the two coefficients describing the first half of the questionaire (IC1 and FP) are above average (see Table 1). The fraction of those checking the nine parts of question 17 is about the same as the whole sample, but the fraction checking the choices in question 18 has decreased by about 20%. This decrease in complaints is responsible for the higher value of IC2.

Although the response of the foreign born were generally more positive, they did respond significantly less positively to question 1. The difference did not appear as negative replies but as abstentions. This group also was less sure than the average that the teacher knew his subject matter. On question 9 they indicated that more than the average that their volume of reading has increased. This would be expected with an increased knowledge of English.

In question 17 (see Table 20), the responses to all parts were consistent with the average. In question 18, however, two parts - f and i - were checked more frequently.

AGES 16 - 19

Of the four different age groups singled out for study, this is the most dissatisfied. The coefficient IC1 (See Table 1) is average, but IC2 and FP are well below average. Surprisingly enough, in the first part of the questionnaire this group gave considerably more opinions of strong agreement, but these were nearly balanced by strong negative opinions. Although the average number of D.'s per questionnaire was about average, the number of A.'s was considerably below the norm. The average number of questions not answered was higher, but this was mostly due to question 8 (See Table 5) on which nearly half of the students failed to respond. (Question 3, therefore, had a lower percentage in agreement; but since very few teenagers have school-age children, this question is meaningless.) On the second half of the questionnaire, there were about 10% fewer responses to question 17 (See Table 20) and about 40% more to question 18, accounting for the low value of IC2.

Fewer of these students felt there was always someone to whom they would talk if they had problems. This is not an unexpected reaction, since fear of being considered too ambitious by one's peers would hinder a closer student/teacher relationship. The students rejected the idea that they read more now (question 9); furthermore, they checked question 17e significantly less frequently.

The persons in this age bracket are more prone to develop strong opinions of their fellow students. They checked "good friends" more frequently as one of the best parts of their attending adult school, but at the same time they are more likely to check "other students" as one of the worst things about the program.

AGES 20 - 29

This group, which is the largest of the four age groups, is about as close to the mean as imaginable. Of the three coefficients (See Table 1), only IC1 varies even slightly from the norm.

No question varies significantly from the mean in the number of positive or negative answers. The distribution of answers for questions 1 - 13 (See Table 6) shows a slight trend away from the "strong" responses toward the more moderate. There were slightly fewer responses to questions 17 and 18 (See Table 20), but the decrease was evenly distributed over all parts of the two questions.

AGES 30 - 39

There was a shift in the responses of this group away from an answer of "Agree" to the other possible answers, primarily to "Strongly Agree" but to some extent to "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" (see Table 7). This lowered the total number of positive responses but raised the weighted value of these responses, resulting in a lower than average value of FP and a higher value of IC1 (Table 1). In the second part of the questionnaire there was an approximate 10% increase in responses to question 17 (see Table 20) while the number of responses to question 18 was about average. The increase in the number of responses to 17 resulted in an increase in the value of IC2 over the mean. None of the coefficients, however, can be considered very different from the mean.

The individual questions offer little information to separate this group from the norm. There is only one question which deviates significantly from the mean. Question 17a was checked slightly more frequently than average.

AGES 40 - 49

Of the four age groups examined, those persons in their 40's were by far the most satisfied. All three coefficients (See Table 1) are above average with IC2 being so by better than 50%. The answers on all questions were more positive and, more importantly, there was a sharp negative deviation from the mean in the number of persons giving uncomplimentary answers. This was most pronounced in the second half of the questionnaire (See Table 20) in that the responses to question 17 were about 25% more numerous than the average, while the numbers of answers to question 18 was over 40% less.

On no question in the first part of the questionnaire did this group give more negative responses; they were significantly more positive in their answers to questions 7, 10, and 13 (See Table 8). The greater response to question 13 is particularly significant since this is the only group to rate significantly higher both "a better job" and "higher pay" in questions 17c and 17d. Satisfaction and the feeling they could do more were also checked significantly more frequently. Another interesting finding for this group is a significantly lower occurrence of "confusion" (18d) on the questionnaire.

HARTFORD ADULT SCHOOL

It is important to note for the following discussions that the difference between Hartford Adult School and the mean is about one half that between Hartford Adult School and the average of other programs as Hartford Adult School makes up about half of the sample population. It seems unnecessary to present another table with the average of all other groups just to compare with Hartford Adult School, so the comparison will be made with the entire population, and the reader is asked to be aware that any difference noted is only one half the actual difference between Hartford Adult School and the average of all other programs.

The three coefficients (see Table 1) for the Hartford Adult School are very close to the mean. The percentages of each possible answers (S.D., D., A., S.A.) for questions 1 - 13 (see Table 21), the Hartford Adult School students checked, on the average, fewer parts for both questions. However, there were about 18% fewer checks on question 18 and 7.5% fewer on question 17 resulting in a more positive net response to the second half of the questionnaire. This is reflected in the slightly higher value of IC2.

On the first part of the questionnaire there are six questions which vary significantly from the mean. However, only one of those (#13) is strongly deviant. In question 3 the number of people agreeing that the studies were more difficult is lower but not quite significantly. The percentage disagreeing, however, is significantly above average. The students are more in agreement that the teacher knew his subject matter, but a somewhat lower than

average number report agreement with the questions (#6 and #7) that deal with the personal interaction between student and teacher. This, perhaps, is indicative of a more structured, traditional approach taken in the Hartford Adult School.

It is a little puzzling that more students reported enjoying reading more but did not indicate in significant numbers that they actually are reading more.

The strongest response recorded on the first half of the questionnaire came on the last question (#13). The response indicates the students feel more strongly that they got all they had expected from their studies. The fact that other programs will necessarily fall below the mean as on this questionnaire should not be looked upon particularly as degrading to them. One must consider the difference in goals set by the individual programs. Many of the smaller programs set more long range goals and are therefore more vulnerable to falling short.

The more structured approach found in the Hartford Adult School program is again evident in questions 17(g) and 18(c) in which fewer students felt that making good friends had been an important part of the experience but in which they indicated they felt the confusion was less. The feeling of less confusion may be attributed to the fact that the students were happier with texts and materials.

Finally, question 18(h) was checked by 2% more Hartford Adult School students than the norm. This fact in itself is not significant but in light of the fact that Hartford Adult School was below norm on all other parts of this questionnaire, it may be considered an upward trend.

C.E.P. ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

In the C.E.P. program the students were given a choice as to whether they would prefer a questionnaire in Spanish or English. The questionnaires were segregated on that basis, and each will be discussed separately.

IC1 for the English speaking questionnaires (see Table 1) returned by the C.E.P. students was about 8% below the norm. This was the result of fewer responses of S.A. (about 1 fewer per questionnaire) which was distributed fairly evenly among the other possible replies. IC2 is about 18% lower which is attributable to a 10% lower response level for question 17 and a corresponding 20% higher response on question 18. The third coefficient, FP, was about on the norm indicating the same percentage of students was satisfied but their individual satisfaction generally was not as great as the norm.

On the related questions 1, 2, and 13 the responses were mixed (see Table 11). There was a significant negative trend on the first and a significant positive trend on the second, while on the third, question 13, there appeared no difference. The students felt the things they had learned were important but not necessarily applicable to their jobs. Over three-quarters found the work not as difficult as they expected. This is somewhat surprising since the students are more critical of the teachers' abilities (questions 4 and 5) than the mean, especially the ability to explain well. There was not, however, any significant variation from the mean on questions 6 and 7 which question the relationship between the student and teacher.

Of the reading questions two (9 and 12) were disappointingly low in positive responses. The third (10) was low but not significantly. A higher than average percent said they had recommended the program.

On the second half of the questionnaire (see Table 21) the students were rather critical. In question 17 only two parts (17a and 17b) were checked significantly different from average and these were both below average although only slightly. These reflect a slight general dissatisfaction with the poor materials and books and with the confusion element. Their replies to question 18i (other students) were not as intense but were still significantly below average.

C.E.P. SPANISH QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses on the C.E.P. questionnaire will be compared to the mean of all questionnaires received from those educated outside the U.S. The three coefficients are above average for the C.E.P. group although none of them is very far above (see Table 1). In the first part of the questionnaire (see Table 12), the C.E.P. group checked fewer A.'s and D.'s but more S.A.'s which resulted in a higher ICl. The total number of responses on question 17 (see Table 21) was higher for the C.E.P. students while on question 18 it was about the same as the average. The difference between this group and the mean is not so much that they have fewer complaints as that they have more positive things to say.

On the first part of the questionnaire this group was anything but average. Their answers varied from the norm on seven of the first thirteen questions. There was a higher percentage of abstention on the Spanish speaking questionnaire, but since the figures discussed are based on the total number of persons answering the questionnaire not just the number answering each question, this can affect the results in only one case. Otherwise the abstentions can only accentuate the difference noted. The one question which is left somewhat in doubt is question 4 on which fewer persons agreed that the teacher knew his subject matter, but the number disagreeing was not significantly different. This is probably linked to the fact that more of the students found the work more difficult, but the question of which is the cause and which is the effect is indeterminant. If more of these students do think the teacher lacking in knowledge, more

at least felt, by their responses to question 7, that he was really interested in them.

More students replied positively to all three reading oriented questions in the first part of the questionnaire as well as to question 17e in the second half. They also reported more frequently they were now better able to help their children with homework.

In question 17 more students reported better reading ability and good friends while in question 18 there was an absence of persons complaining about unimportant subjects.

M.D.T.A. -- G.E.D.

Of the programs evaluated in this study, this program has the lowest satisfaction coefficients (See Table 1). The FP is not so bad as the other two coefficients, but that is to be expected since it is not so sensitive. As these coefficients indicate, the problem was not so much in the number of people satisfied as in the extent of their satisfaction. There were considerably fewer S.A.'s checked in the first part of the questionnaire compared with the average. It should be noted that these results appear less severe when one looks only at the percentage of persons giving unsatisfactory responses (i.e., D. and S.D.) to the questionnaire (See Table 13). These differ from the mean, but not to the extent of the positive responses. The difference is in the high percentage of persons not responding to each question. It seems that many of the students are unsure about their feelings toward the program, which in itself is bad, since it indicates an absence of direction in their minds. This conclusion is supported by the fact that nearly half of the sample checked "confusion" as one of the worst things about the program. Further evidence that the students are unsure of their goals is found in question 2, in which the positive responses were 12% lower for the G.E.D. classes, while the negative responses were insignificantly higher.

The positive responses to question 1 were well below average, as were those to question 13. In question 13, 9% more than average disagreed, while 31% less than average agreed -- 30% more did not respond. These questions show a lack of direction in the students' minds as well as a disappointment in their progress in the program. Students expressed further dissatisfaction in question 17, in which relatively fewer enrollees checked parts a, b, and f.

There is strong evidence in the responses as to the causes of the dissatisfsction. Students on the average checked poor books and materials 14% of the time, while in this program these factors were checked by more than one-half of the students (57%). (This is undoubtedly a major factor in the significantly less favorable responses to questions 9 and 12.) Thirty-five per cent of the students felt that the teachers were unable to explain things well, which is 26% more than the mean. This may account for the increased number of students who find the work more difficult in this program (question 3). The failure of the teacher to communicate is surely related to the confusion sensed by the students -- again, 26% above average.

M.D.T.A. - Basic Foreign Speaking

This group will be compared to the foreign born group from the total sample. It is difficult to analyze this group because of the small number of returns. The first part of the questionnaire has a sample space of eleven persons while the second part has a sample space of six persons.

Before discussing the results it is important that the polling procedure for this group be explained. First, the group received questionnaires in English. The questionnaires were translated and explained by one of the three bi-lingual instructors present. The three instructors then positioned themselves around the room to help those who seemed to be having trouble. The investigators were aware that this was not the best experimental approach but at that time had no questionnaire in Spanish.

This procedure resulted in far more interesting results than was envisioned. The important things to be learned from this experience were not particularly those responses given in the questionnaire but other factors which relate to interrelations between foreign speaking students and teachers.

First, there were 29 questionnaires handed out. Of these, 18 persons apparently received help from a neighbor. Of the other 11 only 6 completed the second part. Of the 18 copied there can be seen many erasures and false starts where the students were obviously trying to fill out the questionnaire but just did not understand what they were being asked to do. However, they did not ask for help although there were people readily available for just that purpose. They preferred to disguise their lack of understanding

by using the answers of those who did understand rather than admitting defeat to their instructors. (These remarks are not intended as a condemnation of the instructors or administrators of this program as they were most helpful throughout, but rather as a comment on attitudes that affect all programs dealing with the non-English speaking.) This, of course, requires one to ask, "Is this behavior latent in all work done by beginning Foreign Speaking students?" This is a question that cannot be answered here but must be considered by the staff of programs where it is applicable. Personnel in such programs should keep in mind that this behavior can only result in a student falling behind in the work until frustration eventually forces his withdrawal from the program.

Because of the small useable response to the questionnaire, a question by question examination is not possible. Even on these questionnaires there was about a 25% increase in unanswered questions. There was an increase, in questions 1 - 13, in the number of answers of "strongly agree" and a corresponding decrease in the other three. This shift is better seen in the coefficients for the first half of the questionnaire (see Table 1). IC1 and *Fr* are both significantly above the mean of all foreign born. IC2 is too delicate for small samples to be of any use. On the basis of this data this would have to rated as a better than average program. Of course, it can be argued that the sample is weighted toward those who read and write better English and presumably have made better progress in the program.

NEW CAREERS

The number of persons failing to answer or giving an answer of S.D. in question 1-13 (see Table 15) was quite small for this group. There was also a solid increase over the maan in the fraction answering A. and S.A. IC1 and F.P. (Table 1) consequently are well above average -- in fact, they are the highest of any primarily English speaking Program. IC2 was pushed above the mean by a substantial increase in the number of checks in question 17 (see Table 21).

In the first part of the questionnaire, the New Careerists showed somewhat above average in positive responses to all questions used to determine the coefficient but were significantly above only in their belief that the studies were more difficult that was expected. There was no significant increase in question 18h to indicate they found this a serious drawback. Also on the first part of the questionnaire there was a trend toward a positive attitude on all the reading questions (#9, #10, and #12) but nothing explicitly reportable. (The attitude of the students toward the teacher was also higher but this must be treated as extremely tenuous due to an oversight on the part of the authors. The first page of the questionnaire has a "thank you" message signed with one of the authors who was the Director of Instruction for this program. This should have been omitted for this group but was overlooked.)

Two parts of question 17, parts f and g, received a significantly higher rating from the New Careers students. In fact they

were checked as often as "knowledge" and "satisfaction". No part of question 18 deviated significantly from the mean.

OTHER PROGRAMS

For a number of programs the returns were too small for a question by question analysis but were sufficient to calculate an IC1 and FP which will give some feeling of the effectiveness of the programs. For small returns IC2 is not reliable and should not be considered representative. Of course, there is some questions as to the value of IC1 and FP but these seem relatively stable even for small samples. These programs are:

Neighborhood Youth Corps
Learn Baby Learn
N.A.B. - J.).B.S.
Hartford Group

It was hoped that other programs could be evaluated but the small return made that impossible.

THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Twenty-nine teacher questionnaires were returned in this study. There was little difference found among questionnaires when grouped by education, experience, or by program. The discussion of the results of this portion of the survey will be of the whole group and will not be sub-divided as were the student returns. Since many of the questions here are of a subjective nature, there will be no attempt to construct an average questionnaire. Rather, each question will be discussed separately.

Length of Service in Program: Here there is a definite difference between those teachers in the Hartford Adult School program and the rest of the sample due to the relative length of time the Hartford Adult School program has been in service. The averages were:

Hartford Adult School - 8.9 years
Other - 1.0 years

Education: Of the 29 persons sampled, there were 14 Bachelor's and 14 Master's degrees. (One undergraduate hired for a specialized art project was included in the sample.) Ten persons reported other training most of which was graduate work toward the next higher degree or the sixth year for teacher certification.

Question 1: Most of the instructors in the Hartford Adult School are regularly full-time teachers in the Hartford School System. Their acquaintance with and subsequent employment in the adult program came through their job. For most other programs, however, this is not such a readily available source of personnel. A large portion of the faculty in these programs were recruited by friends who were already employed by the program. In some of the business

supported programs the instructors came from other jobs within the sponsoring company. Other less frequent contacts ranged from a college recruitment office to meeting the director in a lounge.

Question 2: The majority of Hartford Adult School personnel are part-time. In other programs, however, the majority of the teachers are full-time employees.

Question 3: Only one of the 14 persons answering this question thought there was little or no difference. Another felt they were easily discouraged. The majority felt they were far more motivated than the average student and more reliable in attendance and preparation. It was commented that this was especially true for the foreign born. The students were thought to have developed long-range goals which make them more industrious. Only one teacher felt they were less able.

Question 4: The possible replies to this question are listed in the order they were ranked by the teachers. The number of times each was checked is shown. Twenty-eight persons responded.

Instructor - 23	Facilitator - 9
Counselor - 12	Remedialist - 7
Resource - 11	Tutor - 5
	Other - 5

The "other" responses were guide, friend, builder of self-confidence, and some general vague discourse on educational theory.

Question 5: The responses to this question were ranked by giving one point for each circle and two points for a double circle. The goals are listed in the order of total value with the calculated rating in parentheses.

The tabulated responses to question 5 are:

	Once Circled	Twice Circled	Rating No.
Self Worth	5	16	(37)
Practical Application	10	10	(30)
Reasoning Skills	13	8	(29)
Subject Matter	12	8	(28)
Reading Comprehension	9	8	(25)
Group Functioning	5	10	(25)
Self Discipline	6	9	(24)
Vocabulary	16	3	(22)
Greater Interest in Reading	6	8	(22)
Conceptualization	12	5	(22)
Inquisitiveness	8	6	(20)
Increased Effectiveness in the Community	5	7	(19)
Cooperativeness	6	4	(14)
Other	2	5	(12)
Reading Speed	7	1	(9)
Leadership	5	0	(5)

Two others that were listed more than once in the "other" category and perhaps should have been included in the listing are "Pass G.E.D." and "Communication Skills".

Question 6: The seven choices listed in the order they were selected with the number of times each was circled are presented in the following table. Additional remarks by teachers on this question are "desire for more education" and "greater self-confi-

dence". The more important comments are:

Better Job	19
Increased Personal Awareness	18
Increased Social Awareness	15
Further Training	14
Raise in Income	12
Study Skills	12
Functional Literacy	9

Question 7: Although the teachers were presented with no fixed choices in answering this question, little discretion was necessary in categorizing their responses as they were generally articulate and in surprising agreement. Greater self-confidence was the single outstanding change noted by the teachers. The other changes in order of the times they were mentioned are:

Desire For More Education

Better Ability to Express Themselves

Increased Respect for Their Abilities

Sense of Accomplishment

Awareness

Relief at Having Passed the G.E.D.

None

Questions 8 and 9: Here again there is a difference in the answers supplied by the teachers in the Hartford Adult School program. In both cases the average actual class size exceeded the average ideal size. The figures of both groups are:

	H.A.S.	Other
Actual Class Size	23.2	13.1
Ideal Class Size	17.5	11.8

QUESTION 10: The average teacher feels that there is a need to "water down" material in adult education. Of the 25 responding there were 13 yes's, 3 sometimes, and 9 no's. For their reasons for "watering down" the material, the teachers gave "poor educational background", length of time out of school", and "language differences, the last being a special problem with double illiterates.

QUESTION 11: The answers to this question were rather vague on a number of questionaires. Answers such as "subjective personal evaluation" and "the students ability to undertake academic challenges" do not yield much real information. It was established, however, that the majority of the teachers rely upon written examinations as a grading technique.

QUESTION 12: The answers ranged from "they seem to accept it" to "very well". There were no specifically negative replies. The responses were grouped into three categories and the number of responses in each were:

Very Well	8
Fairly Well	15
Neutral	4

QUESTION 13: Here again it was necessary to devise categories for the answer. All of the replies given are mentioned below with the number of times each appeared.

Personal or Family Problems	8
Illness	7
Long Day	7
Got Better Job	5
Frustration	5
Lack of Interest	4
Lack of Money	3
Change in Job Requirements	2
Laziness	2
Loss of Job	2
Fear of Embarrassment	1
Baby Sitter Problems	1
Pregnancy	1
Military Service	1

Frustration was mentioned as a special problem in the education of double illiterates. The teachers mentioning a long day as a reason for dropping out were not particularly those in the H.A.S. program. This reason distributed fairly evenly throughout the programs examined.

QUESTION 14: The changes with the number of times each was mentioned are:

More and Better Materials	7
More and Better Faculty	6
Wider Curriculum	6
Smaller Classes	4
More Audio-Visual Aids	4

More Classroom Space	3
More Homogenous Groups	2
Guidance Counselors	2
Tutors	2
Means to Assure Attendance	2

Others mentioned once each are cooperative teaching, contemporary reading material, free courses, more students, child care arrangements, and educational consultants. Two persons answered that the list would be too extensive and time consuming to write out.

QUESTION 15: The following responses were recorded for these questions:

Yes	14
Some	4
No	9

Particular areas in which teachers felt training was necessary were awareness of specialized educational needs, awareness of the problems faced by the students, group interaction, and in teaching techniques. Others mentioned were program planning, curriculum coordination, counseling, and subject matter.

QUESTION 16: The following responses were recorded.

Yes	9
Some	7
No	13

It is important to note that these figures represent the opinion of the instructors and not necessarily the philosophy of the program. The figures are influenced by the extent to which the students are involved in the planning of the individual classes.

TABLE 1

SATISFACTION COEFFICIENTS FOR ALL GROUPS

GROUPING	IC1	IC2	F.P.
Total	.52	.52	.86
Male	.50	.53	.84
Female	.53	.51	.85
Age			
17-19	.51	.36	.80
20-29	.50	.53	.85
30-39	.54	.55	.84
40-49	.61	.79	.94
Foreign Born	.54	.61	.86
H.A.S.	.52	.56	.85
C.E.P.			
Spanish	.62	.65	.90
English	.48	.43	.85
M.D.T.A.			
G.E.D.	.40	.24	.78
B.F.S.	.63	.51	.92
New Careers	.58	.63	.89
N.Y.C.	.42	.15*	.80
L.B.L.	.50	.73*	.92
N.A.B.-J.O.B.S.	.51	.20*	.88
Hartford Group	.56	1.0 *	.93

*For very small samples, IC2 is extremely sensitive and should not be relied upon.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	4	12	49	22	12
2	4	10	45	37	4
3	20	40	24	13	4
4	0	3	46	46	4
5	1	8	46	42	3
6	4	12	51	30	4
7	3	10	53	31	4
8	3	9	37	24	26
9	4	11	47	31	6
10	2	24	43	25	5
11	2	7	46	40	5
12	3	12	46	34	6
13	5	21	38	27	9

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR ALL MALES

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	4	12	56	22	6
2	3	10	46	40	1
3	15	41	30	11	3
4	0	4	44	51	0
5	0	11	44	43	1
6	7	10	51	28	3
7	2	11	62	20	3
8	5	11	43	18	23
9	3	15	46	34	2
10	2	24	46	24	4
11	3	10	39	43	4
12	2	12	48	35	2
13	10	23	40	25	2

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR ALL FEMALES

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	7	15	37	21	20
2	1	11	44	36	8
3	13	35	29	15	8
4	0	5	40	45	9
5	0	7	44	43	7
6	4	7	59	28	3
7	3	8	52	32	5
8	4	9	28	28	31
9	3	7	47	39	5
10	4	21	44	23	8
11	4	5	43	45	3
12	0	8	49	36	7
13	8	20	41	20	11

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR PERSONS AGES 16 - 19

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	6	20	37	26	11
2	6	6	37	46	6
3	34	23	20	20	3
4	0	3	28	60	9
5	0	17	29	49	6
6	3	20	26	40	11
7	6	9	31	49	6
8	6	0	23	26	46
9	17	14	31	34	9
10	11	26	43	17	9
11	9	6	34	49	9
12	6	23	29	40	9
13	9	20	37	29	6

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR PERSONS AGES 20 - 29

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	2	13	50	23	12
2	6	12	42	36	5
3	16	44	24	13	4
4	0	2	56	39	2
5	1	7	49	39	4
6	4	11	55	27	4
7	2	11	57	24	6
8	1	11	45	21	21
9	1	12	54	30	4
10	1	27	43	24	5
11	2	10	51	33	4
12	4	8	55	30	4
13	7	24	36	26	7

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR PERSONS AGES 30 - 39

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	9	7	41	27	16
2	2	11	43	39	4
3	18	36	25	16	4
4	2	4	25	61	7
5	2	11	30	54	2
6	7	11	39	41	2
7	5	4	50	41	0
8	5	18	30	30	18
9	2	16	43	34	4
10	0	34	27	36	2
11	0	14	32	52	2
12	2	16	39	39	5
13	9	16	34	27	14

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR PERSONS AGES 40 - 49

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	7	7	48	21	17
2	3	7	55	28	7
3	34	24	31	7	3
4	0	0	41	59	0
5	0	0	52	45	3
6	0	10	55	31	4
7	0	3	59	38	0
8	3	10	34	21	31
9	0	17	45	31	7
10	0	10	48	38	4
11	0	7	55	38	0
12	0	7	55	31	7
13	3	7	48	34	7

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR FOREIGN BORN IN SAMPLE

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	7	15	37	21	20
2	1	11	44	36	8
3	13	35	29	15	8
4	0	5	40	45	9
5	0	7	44	43	7
6	4	7	59	28	3
7	3	8	52	32	5
8	4	9	28	28	31
9	3	7	47	39	5
10	4	21	44	23	8
11	4	5	43	45	3
12	0	8	49	36	7
13	8	20	41	20	11

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR HARTFORD ADULT SCHOOL

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	6	15	52	23	4
2	5	14	39	42	1
3	19	45	24	10	1
4	0	2	43	52	4
5	1	5	44	48	5
6	5	15	51	26	5
7	3	12	56	24	5
8	3	8	36	26	27
9	5	9	48	32	6
10	2	25	42	27	4
11	1	9	41	43	6
12	3	10	46	37	5
13	5	18	39	32	6

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR C.E.F. ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

Question Number	S D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	9	4	32	27	27
2	0	0	63	27	4
3	18	59	4	18	0
4	0	9	59	27	4
5	4	14	50	27	4
6	0	14	54	23	9
7	4	4	59	27	4
8	9	4	41	23	23
9	9	18	50	14	9
10	0	23	50	14	14
11	0	0	59	36	4
12	9	27	36	23	4
13	4	18	36	27	14

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR C.E.P. - SPANISH QUESTIONAIRE

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	4	14	36	18	27
2	4	0	41	36	18
3	9	9	36	18	27
4	0	4	32	41	23
5	0	4	41	50	4
6	4	0	36	54	4
7	0	0	41	54	4
8	0	4	32	41	23
9	0	4	36	59	0
10	9	18	46	27	0
11	4	4	36	54	0
12	0	0	41	46	14
13	9	23	41	9	18

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR M.D.T.A. - G.E.D. CLASSES

Question Number	S.D. (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	0	9	39	17	35
2	0	17	39	30	13
3	13	30	35	17	4
4	4	4	70	17	4
5	4	30	44	17	4
6	0	17	44	35	4
7	4	9	61	26	0
8	0	9	48	17	26
9	0	22	48	13	17
10	0	9	52	22	17
11	0	13	52	26	9
12	4	17	56	1[illegible]	9
13	0	35	22	13	30

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR N.D.T.A. BASIC FOREIGN SPEAKING

Question Number	S.D. (N)*	D. (N)	A. (N)	S.A. (N)	Did Not Respond (N)
1	0	1	0	2	8
2	0	0	4	6	1
3	2	5	4	0	0
4	0	0	5	6	0
5	0	0	5	6	0
6	0	0	9	2	0
7	0	0	5	6	0
8	0	1	5	3	2
9	0	1	5	5	0
10	0	3	3	2	3
11	2	0	5	4	0
12	0	1	4	5	1
13	0	3	4	2	2

*N denotes raw numbers not percentages.

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR THE NEW CAREERS PROGRAM

Question Number	S.D (%)	D. (%)	A. (%)	S.A. (%)	Did Not Respond (%)
1	7	0	67	20	7
2	0	20	60	20	0
3	7	33	33	27	0
4	0	0	47	53	0
5	0	0	67	33	0
6	0	13	40	47	0
7	0	7	53	40	0
8	0	7	40	33	0
9	0	0	47	47	7
10	7	13	40	40	0
11	0	7	47	40	7
12	0	13	33	47	7
13	7	20	33	33	7

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Question Number	S.D. (N)*	D. (N)	A. (N)	S.A. (N)	Did Not Respond (N)
1	0	0	6	2	0
2	0	0	5	3	0
3	2	2	1	2	1
4	0	1	5	2	0
5	0	1	5	2	0
6	0	2	3	2	1
7	0	3	0	3	2
8	1	1	2	3	1
9	0	0	5	3	0
10	0	5	1	2	0
11	0	0	4	3	1
12	1	2	3	2	0
13	2	2	3	1	0

* N denotes raw numbers not percentages.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR LEARN BABY LEARN PROGRAM

Question Number	S.D. (N)*	D. (N)	A. (N)	S.A. (N)	Did Not Respond (N)
1	0	2	3	0	1
2	0	0	4	2	0
3	1	2	2	1	0
4	0	1	3	2	0
5	0	0	3	2	1
6	0	0	5	1	0
7	0	0	4	2	0
8	0	0	6	0	0
9	0	0	2	3	1
10	0	1	4	1	0
11	0	0	4	2	0
12	0	0	5	1	0
13	0	3	3	0	0

*N denotes raw numbers not percentages.

TABLE 18

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR N.A.B.-J.O.B.S.

Question Number	S.D. (N)*	D. (N)	A. (N)	S.A. (N)	Did Not Respond (N)
1	0	1	3	1	0
2	0	0	5	0	0
3	4	1	0	0	0
4	0	0	3	2	0
5	0	2	1	2	0
6	0	0	3	2	0
7	0	0	2	3	0
8	0	0	3	0	2
9	1	0	3	0	1
10	0	1	3	1	0
11	0	0	4	1	0
12	0	0	3	1	1
13	1	1	2	0	1

*N denotes raw numbers not percentages.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS 1 - 13
FOR HARTFORD GROUP

Question Number	S.D. (N)*	D. (N)	A. (N)	S.A. (N)	Did Not Respond (N)
1	0	0	4	1	0
2	0	0	5	0	0
3	2	2	1	0	0
4	0	0	1	4	0
5	0	0	3	2	0
6	0	0	2	2	1
7	0	1	2	2	0
8	0	2	1	0	2
9	0	3	2	0	0
10	0	1	2	1	1
11	0	1	3	1	0
12	0	2	2	1	0
13	0	0	4	1	0

*N denotes raw numbers not percentages

TABLE 20

SUM OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 17 AND 18

FOR AGE AND SEX GROUPINGS

Grouping	Sample Size	Question 17									Question 18								
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i
Total	(291)*	69	56	20	13	50	50	39	58	6	14	12	8	22	9	14	5	19	12
Males	(77)	69	59	16	13	53	42	32	60	10	1[illegible]	13	13	23	4	9	7	16	10
Females	(171)	70	58	20	13	46	53	39	58	4	14	11	4	22	9	22	5	20	12
Ages 17-19	(35)	66	54	11	9	26	43	57	57	9	23	20	11	26	11	23	6	11	23
Ages 20-29	(76)	71	66	20	10	58	53	33	55	4	18	9	7	26	8	12	7	20	9
Ages 30-39	(42)	83	60	12	17	55	60	38	64	7	10	7	7	21	12	21	5	21	10
Ages 40-49	(25)	76	72	36	24	56	64	36	76	8	4	4	0	4	0	8	0	16	16
Foreign Born	(65)	74	52	23	17	56	43	45	52	6	15	14	8	15	8	3	3	18	5

* Figures in parentheses are raw numbers -all others are percentages.

TABLE 21

SUM OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 17 AND 18

FOR ALL EVALUATED PROGRAMS

Grouping	Sample Size	Question 17									Question 18								
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i
Total	(291)*	69	56	20	13	50	50	39	58	6	14	12	8	22	9	14	5	19	12
H.A.S.	(172)	70	54	17	11	46	49	26	56	6	5	14	6	16	5	11	5	21	10
C.E.P. (Spanish)	(16)	75	56	19	19	75	56	69	56	12	25	0	19	12	12	0	0	12	12
C.E.P. (English)	(21)	62	48	19	14	48	48	38	57	0	29	5	10	33	14	19	5	14	5
M.D.T.A.-G.E.D.	(21)	48	43	14	14	48	33	43	67	0	57	0	10	48	10	14	14	24	14
M.D.T.A.-B.F.S.	(6)	(3)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(4)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(0)	(2)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
New Careers	(15)	73	67	20	13	53	73	67	60	13	0	7	7	33	0	20	7	20	7
N.Y.C.	(9)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(0)	(5)	(4)	(8)	(7)	(0)	(5)	(3)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(5)
L.B.L.	(6)	(4)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(5)	(5)	(2)	(4)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(2)
N.A.B.-J.O.B.S.	(5)	(3)	(2)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(2)	(2)

* Figures in parentheses are raw numbers -all others are percentages.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Much of the data herin is relevant to specific programs and is compiled with the intention that it will be helpful to those programs. Other data lead to conclusions which will be of use to the community at large. These are presented with some recommendations for action.

1) There is an apparent lack of communication and coordination among existing programs. There are areas of duplication and development in some programs which would be of great use to others. The CAMPS sub-committee on basic education, under the chairmanship of Mr. Eugene Belisle, would seem to be the appropriate agent for this task. It is recommended that the CAMPS sub-committee, using the lists compiled in this report a) serve as an information resource for agencies involved in adult basic education; b) develop city-wide long range plans for the development of programs to serve populations not now served; c) oversee research on problems deemed significant by programs functioning.

2) The data indicate a fairly uniform high level of functioning for existing programs. There does exist, however, little data on populations not served. The success of enrollees who entered study through concentrated programs of recruitment, such as those of the Poor People's Federation, leads to the assumption that greater numbers of people can be served if they can be identified. It is recommended that a) programs seek means of extending recruitment; b) a study of non-school attending populations be conducted subsequent to the release of the 1970 census figures; c) programs be devised to serve those populations which do not receive basic education currently.

3) Teachers themselves have indicated a desire for specific training in problems of adult students. No extensive study seems to be needed, but programs are advised that a need for some such training does exist. The CAMPS sub-committee may be an appropriate organ for coordinating a basic training program, but specific training must be the responsibility of the individual program.

4) Very little follow-up study is done by most programs. The true index of a student's success in a program of basic education is best assessed by following his progress beyond the termination with the program. The area of evaluation, through follow-up, would seem to have been assigned by many programs, a priority lower than what is deserved.

5) The problems of teaching the Spanish speaking are only recently being addressed. The Learning Center is one creative approach to the problem and seems to have a high success factor. Other programs have taken the initiative in dealing with this population and its special problems.

6) The current condition of the labor market seems a strong factor in business' and industry's present token support of programs. Funding for special training is available, but entry level jobs are not. A significant improvement in the city's labor problems should remedy this condition.

7) There are few paper-and-pencil tests valid for adults functioning at the basic level. Furthermore, many members of the adult student population respond poorly to such testing and experience great frustration and anxiety in testing situations. There is an immediate need for improved testing methods and for more appropriate placement of students according to ability level, especially upgrading the foreign born.

8) Adopt procedures that fully integrate the goals of the student with those of the program. Have periodic sessions to make sure that the student fully understands the directions he is taking.

9) Provide more contemporary material for all courses but especially for those with young enrollees. It is recommended that a resource center be developed for use by all programs. This center would provide samples of the current testing, curriculum, and teacher training materials available.

10) Closer attention should be paid to instruction in study skills. Often the apparently simple study skills of paper-and-pencil testing, highlighting information, and selective reading of material can create serious impediments to learning and devastating undermining of self-confidence.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

ADMINISTRATOR INSTRUMENT

DATE: _____

Title of Program:

Address: Phone:

Director:

Sponsorship:

Funding:

Primary Goals of the Program:

No. of Enrollees (Current): Male: Female:

No. of Enrollees in Past One Year: Male: Female:

No. of Spanish Speaking Enrollees:

Median Income Level or Range of Enrollees:

No. of Administrators:

No. of Teaching Personnel:

No. of Supportive Services:

Annual Budget:

Actual Cost Per Enrollee:

Tuition Charged Enrollee:

Incidental Instructional Expenses Charged Enrollee:

Description of Instruction Offered (Courses, etc.):

Programs specifically oriented toward Spanish Speaking:

How is your staff recruited:

What percentage of your staff is full-time? %

What percentage of your staff is paid (as opposed to volunteer)? %

What percentage of your staff are professional teachers? %

Do enrollees participate in planning the program?

Is there provision for in-service training of teachers?

If so, what?

What supportive services are offered?

How are enrollees recruited?

How are enrollees selected?

Do you have an ethnic group breakdown of enrollees?

If so, give statistics:

Do you select enrollees to suit a designed program or do you suit the program to the enrollees?

What impact does your program have on the community?

In what areas do you feel your program meets its greatest success?

In what areas do you feel your program has not met its own expectations?

What plans do you have for expansion and development of the program?

APPENDIX II

TEACHER INSTRUMENT

NAME:

PROGRAM:

Length of Service in Program

Education:

College/University:

Degree: Major:

Other Training:

Experience in Education:

Present Teaching Position

Grade Level:

1. How did you come to teach in this program?

2. Is your position with this program your full-time position?

   If not, what is your full-time occupation

3. If you teach elsewhere, how do the students in this program differ from the others that you teach? (Include motivation, attitudes, willingness to work, attendance)

4. How do you see your role as a teacher in this program?

   Instructor Remedialist

   Counselor Resource

   Facilitator Tutor

   Other _____

5. What learning goals have you set for your students? Please circle twice those goals you consider primary and once those which are secondary.

1. Subject Matter
2. Reading Speed
3. Reading Comprehension
4. Leadership
5. Vocabulary
6. Self-Discipline
7. Cooperativeness
8. Greater Interest in Reading
9. Self-Worth
10. Reasoning Skills
11. Inquisitiveness
12. Group Functioning
13. Conceptualization
14. Practical Application
15. Increased Effectiveness in the Community
16. Other _____

6. What direct effects does your teaching or the program have on the students? Circle and Add Others.

1 Better Job
2. Raise in Income
3. Further Training
4. Functional Literacy
5. Study Skills
6. Increased Personal Awareness
7. Increased Social Awareness

7. What changes do you notice in your students upon completion of your course?

8. What do you consider to be the ideal class size for this type of student?

9. What is your average class size?

10. Is it necessary to "water down" material for presentation to your students?

11. What methods of evaluation do you employ in your classes?

12. How do your students respond to your teaching techniques?

13. Why do students drop out of the program?

14. If your program were to be ideally funded, full staffed and fully equipped, what changes would you like to see?

15. Do you feel any need for in-service training for yourself and others on the job staff? If yes, in what areas?

16. Do enrollees in the program participate in the planning of the curriculum or other aspects of the program?

APPENDIX III

ENROLLEE INSTRUMENT

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

COMMUNITY RENEWAL TEAM

These questions are about your participation in the _____ _____ program. We are trying to find out what kinds of things could be done to make this and all other programs in Hartford better. When you answer, you will be helping many other students.

Most of the questions ask you if you, Strongly Disagree (S.D.), Disagree (D.), Strongly Agree (S.A.), Agree (A.) with the statement. Here is an example: I feel television is good for my children. S.D. _____, D. _____, S.A. _____, A. _____. Suppose you disagree, then you would check D. ✓.

I want to thank you in advance for helping us and the many people who will be helped because you took a few minutes to answer.

Thanks,

Professor Gene Mulcahy
University of Hartford

HIGHEST GRADE REACHED:

LAST YEAR YOU ATTENDED SCHOOL:

WHERE YOU LAST ATTENDED:

SEX:

AGE (Optional):

PRESENT JOB:

S.D.	D.	A.	S.A.	
___	___	___	___	1. I have been able to use what I learned directly in my work.
___	___	___	___	2. I learned those things I felt were most important for me to learn.
___	___	___	___	3. The studies were more difficult than I expected.
___	___	___	___	4. The teacher knew his subject matter.
___	___	___	___	5. The teacher knew how to explain things well.
___	___	___	___	6. There was always someone I could talk to if I had a problem.
___	___	___	___	7. The teachers seemed really interested in me.
___	___	___	___	8. I am better able to help my kids with homework.
___	___	___	___	9. I read more now.
___	___	___	___	10. I read the newspaper everyday.
___	___	___	___	11. I have recommended the program to friends.
___	___	___	___	12. I enjoy reading more.
___	___	___	___	13. I got out of my studies all that I had hoped.

14. I left the program because (may not apply) _____

_____

15. If I were in charge of the program, I would make these changes.

_____

_____

16. The things I want to know most are: _____

_____

_____

17. The things I got most out of the program were (please check):

a) Knowledge
b) Satisfaction
c) Better Job
d) Salary Increase
e) Better Reading Ability
f) Wider Interests
g) Good Friends
h) Feeling I could do more
i) Other _____

18. The things I felt were worst about the program (please check):

a) Poor Materials and Books
b) Unimportant Subjects
c) Poor Teaching
d) Confusion in the Program
e) Poor Physical Facilities
f) Bad Location of Class
g) Lack of Availability
h) Too Difficult or Too Fast Work
i) Other Students

19. Because I studied in the program, I got a better job.

YES ___ NO ___

20. I am satisfied with my present job.

YES ___ NO ___

APPENDIX III A

ENROLLEE INSTRUMENT (SPANISH FORM)

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

COMMUNITY RENEWAL TEAM

Estas preguntas son acerca de su participacion en el programa _____ _____. Estamos tratando de averiguar que clase de cosas se deberian hacer para mejorar este y todos los otros programas en Hartford. Contestando las preguntas ud. Ayudara a muchos otros estudiantes.

La mayoria de las preguntas son para saber si ud. Esta en completo desacuerdo (C.D.), En Desacuerdo (D.), De Acuerdo (A.), O Completamente De Acuerdo (C.A.). Suponga ud. Que esta en desacuerdo con alguna de las afirmaciones. En ese caso ud. Debe marcar D. _____.

Quiero agradecerle de antemano por ayudarnos a nosotros y a tantas otras personas al darnos unos minutos de su tiempo para contestar estas preguntas.

Muy Agradecio,

Professor Gene Mulcahy
University of Hartford

GRADO MAS ALTO OBTENIDO: SEXO: EDAD:

CUAL FUE EL ULTIMO ANO QUE US. ASISTIO A LA ESCUELA

CUAL FUE LA ULTIMA ESCUELA A LA CUAL UD. ASISTIO

_____

CIUDAD ESTADO PAIS

EMPLEO ACTUAL:

C.D. D. A. C.A.

___ ___ ___ ___ 1. He podido usar directamente en mi trabajo todo lo que aprendí.

___ ___ ___ ___ 2. Aprendí aquellas cosas que yo considero mas importantes.

___ ___ ___ ___ 3. Los estudios eran mas difíciles de lo que yo esperaba.

___ ___ ___ ___ 4. El profesor conocía la asignatura.

___ ___ ___ ___ 5. El profesor explicaba bien.

___ ___ ___ ___ 6. Siempre había alguien conquien yo podía hablar si tenía un problema.

___ ___ ___ ___ 7. Los profesores parecían realmente interesados en mí.

___ ___ ___ ___ 8. Estoy mas capacitado para ayudar a mis hijos con sus tareas escolares.

___ ___ ___ ___ 9. Leo mas ahora.

___ ___ ___ ___ 10. Leo el periódico todos los días.

___ ___ ___ ___ 11. He recomendado el programa a mis amigos.

___ ___ ___ ___ 12. Disfruto mas cuando leo.

___ ___ ___ ___ 13. He obtendío de mis estudios lo que esperaba.

14. Abandone el programa porque (si es el caso) _____

_____

15. Si yo estuviera a cargo del programa haría los siguientes cambios:

_____

_____

_____

16. Las cosas que yo mas deseo aprender son: _____

_____

_____

17. Lo que mas obtuve del programa fue (haga el favor de marcar):

a) Conocimiento
b) Satisfaccion
c) Mejor Trabajo
d) Aumento de Sueldo
e) Mas Habilidad Para Leer
f) Mas Amplios Intereses
g) Buenos Amigos
h) La Sensacion de Que Puedo Rendir Mas
i) Otras Cosas: _____

18. Lo que considero peor del programa (haga el favor de marcar):

a) Escacez de Materiales y Libros
b) Materias que No Eran Importantes
c) Ensenanza Probre
d) Confusion en El Programa
e) Facilidades Fisicas Inadecuadas
f) Mala Ubicacion de Los Salones de Clase
g) Falta de Disponibilidad
h) Trabajo Demasiado Dificil o Demasiado Rapido
i) Otros Estudiantes

19. Por haber estudiado en el programa conseguí un jejor empleo.

Si ____ No ____

20. Estoy Satisfecho con mi empleo actual.

Si ____ No ___

(Arrangements for translation made by Alejandro Laluz, Concentrated Employment Program.)

APPENDIX IV

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LITERATURE ON HAND

Colorado State Department of Education. Participation in Public School Education. Denver, 1969.

Easley, Edar M. Concentrated Employment Program - New Careers Motivation Project. University of California, Los Angeles Extension, 1968.

Gran, James R. Eighth Teacher Evaluation and Pre-Post Test Results of the Jackson County Adult Evening High School Completion Program, 1969.

Grainleigh Ass. Inc., Field Test and Evaluation of Selected Adult Education (Basic) Systems and Follow-up Report, 1966.

Manpower Division, Department of Labor, Breakthrough for Disadvantaged Youth. Washington, D. C., 1969.

National Association for Public School Adult Education. Survey of Adult Basic Education in New Hampshire. Washington, D. C., 1969.

National University Extension, Ass. Evaluation and Final Report. The National Adult Basic Education Teacher Training Program, Summer of 1966. Maryland, 1968.

Seaman, Don. F. and Kohler, Emmett T. Adult Basic Education in Mississippi. An Evaluation. Mississippi State Department of Education, Jackson, Mississippi. Mississippi State University, State College. Bureau of Educational Research, 1969.

Shearon, Ronald H. and Puder, William H. A Preliminary Report on the Pilot Study. "The Effect of Adult Basic Education on the Occupational Adjustment and Acculturation of the Low Literate Adult." 1970.

Snyder, Frank. The Professional Needs of the Adult Basic Education Teachers in State of Maryland, 1968.

Steele, Sara M. and Moss, Gwenna M. The Criteria in Problem Evaluation. 1970.

Vermeullin, Robert. A Study of a Selected Man-Power Development Training Act Program for Training Adults. 1968.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brody, E. B., and Derbyshire, R. L. "Prejudice in American Negro College Students," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 14 (1967).

California State Dept. of Education. Basic Education for Adults. Sacramento, 1965.

Cass, Angelica. Adult Elementary Education. Noble and Noble. 1956.

Celebrezze, Anthony J. Education and Training. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1965.

Chamber of Commerce of U. S. The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment. Prepared by Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity. Third Report. 1966.

Christensen, C. M. "A Note on Dogmatism and Learning," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXVI (July, 1962) p. 75.

Comrey, Andrew L. "Review of the General Aptitude Test Battery," Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Gryphon Press. 1959.

Combs, Arthur, and Snygg, D. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper, 1949.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Cooper, Williams M. Training the Hard-Core Unemployed. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1964.

Derbyshire, R. L., Brody E. B., and Schleifer, Carl. "The Family Structure of Young Adult Negro Male Mental Patients: Preliminary Observations from Urban Baltimore," Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, Vol. 136, No. 3 (March, 1963).

Dollard, John, and Miller, Noel E. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

Eastland, Jefferson W. The Teacher and School Administration. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1959.

Edgerton, Harold. The Delaware Multi-Occupational Project. Washington, D. C.: Performance Research Inc., 1964.

Fernald, Grace M. Remedial Techniques in Basic School Subjects. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1943.

Grant, W. Vance. "Literacy in the U. C.," School Life, XIV (April, 1962), p. 18.

Greenleigh Associates. Educational Rehabilitation, An Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program for the State of Illinois. New York, 1965.

Greenleigh Associates. Field Test and Evaluation of Selected Adult Basic Education Systems. New York, 1966.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America, New York: Macmillan Co., 1966.

Hilliard, Raymond M. First, They Must Read: A Study to Determine the Literacy of Able-Bodied Persons Receiving Public Assistance in East St. Louis, Illinois. For the Cook County Dept. of Public Aid. Chicago, 1964.

Hobsbawm, E. J. Social Bandits and Primitive Rebels. Free Press, 1963.

Hook, Sidney. Education for Modern Man. New York: Dial Press, 1953.

Houle, Cyril. Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1960.

Johnstone, J. W. C., and Rivera, R. J. Volunteers for Learning. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Knox, Alan B. Adult Basic Education. New York: Centre for Adult Education, Columbia University, 1967.

Lanjon, Richard I., and Schwartz, Milton M. "The Sociology of Exclusion: Implications for Teaching Adult Illiterates," Adult Education, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (Autumn, 1966).

Lanning, Frank W., and Many, Wesley, A. Basic Education for the Disadvantaged Adult. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.

Matthews, Joseph L. The Cooperative Extension Service of the United States in Rural Social Systems and Adult Education. Michigan State College Press, 1953.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Free Press, 1963.

Miller, Herman P. Rich Man, Poor Man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964.

National Association for Public School Adult Education. Adult Basic Education: A Guide for Teachers and Teacher Trainers. Washington, 1966.

National Education Association. The American Public School Teacher 1965-1966. Washington, 1967.

National Association for Public School Adult Education. Focus on Public School Adult Education. (Fourth Yearbook). Washington, 1964.

National Association for Public School Adult Education. How Adults Can Learn More... Faster. Washington, 1966.

National Association for Public School Adult Education. When You're Teaching Adults. Washington, 1945.

Orshansky, Mollie. "Recounting the Poor--A Five-Year Review," Social Security Bulletin, (April, 1966).

Pearce, Frank P. Basic Education Teachers, Seven Needed Qualities. Modesto Junior College, Calif., 1966.

Pucher, William H., and Hand, H. E. "Personality Factors Which May Interfere With the Learning of Adult Basic Education Students," Adult Education, Vol. XVIII, No. 2 (1968).

Short, Veal M., and Carter, Phillip R. Speaking About Adults ... and the Continuing Educational Process. Northern Illinois University, June 13-24, 1966.

Thatcher, J. H. Public School Adult Education. National Association for Public School Adult Education. Washington, 1965.

Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. Random House, 1964.

U. S. Congress, Subcommittee on Education of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Works. White House Conference on Education. 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.

U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. A Conceptual Model of an Adult Basic Education Evaluation System. A report by Management Technology Inc. Washington, 1967.

U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Educationaly Deficient Adults: Their Education and Training Needs. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1965.

U. S. Dept. of Labor. Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1967.

U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The Adult Literary Project. Mass. Council for Public Schools. Washington, 1965.

U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Dimensions of Poverty in 1964. Washington, 1965.

Wattenberg, Ben J. The USA, Unexpected Family Portrait of 194,067,296 Americans Drawn from the Census. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Whittmore, Robert G., Echcuerria, B. P., and Griffin, John V. "Can We Use Existing Tests for Adult Basic Education?," Adult Education, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (Autumn, 1966).

Williams, Robin. American Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Wirtz, Willard. Manpower Research and Training. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1964.

Woolman, Myron, and Carey, Gordon R. Literacy Training and Upward Mobility in Community Action. For Institute of Educational Research. Washington, 1966.